



# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

VOLUME: III

DATE: THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1988

BEFORE: M.I. JEFFERY, Q.C. Chairman  
E. MARTEL Member  
A. KOVEN Member

FOR HEARING UPDATES CALL (TOLL-FREE): 1-800-387-8810

**EARR**  
ASSOCIATES &  
REPORTING INC.

(416) 482-3277

2300 Yonge St., Suite 709, Toronto, Canada M4P 1E4

CA24N  
EAB  
- H26  
v. 3







HEARING ON THE PROPOSAL BY THE MINISTRY OF NATURAL  
RESOURCES FOR A CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR  
TIMBER MANAGEMENT ON CROWN LANDS IN ONTARIO

IN THE MATTER of the Environmental  
Assessment Act, R.S.O. 1980, c.140;

- and -

IN THE MATTER of the Class Environmental  
Assessment for Timber Management on Crown  
Lands in Ontario;

- and -

IN THE MATTER of an Order-in-Council  
(O.C. 2449/87) authorizing the  
Environmental Assessment Board to  
administer a funding program, in  
connection with the environmental  
assessment hearing with respect to the  
Timber Management Class  
Environmental Assessment, and to  
distribute funds to qualified  
participants.

-----

Hearing held at the Ramada Prince Arthur  
Hotel, 17 North Cumberland St.  
Thunder Bay, Ontario, on Thursday,  
May 12th, 1988, commencing  
at 9:30 a.m.


-----

VOLUME III

BEFORE:

MR. MICHAEL I. JEFFERY, Q.C.	Chairman
MR. ELIE MARTEL	Member
MRS. ANNE KOVEN	Member





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116519935>



A P P E A R A N C E S

MR. V. FREIDIN )	MINISTRY OF NATURAL
MS. C. BLASTORAH)	RESOURCES
MS. K. MURPHY )	
MR. B. CAMPBELL)	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT
MS. J. SEABORN )	
MR. R. TUER )	ONTARIO FOREST INDUSTRY
MR. R. COSMAN )	ASSOCIATION and ONTARIOO
MS. E. CRONK )	LUMBER MANUFACTURING
MR. P.R. CASSIDY)	ASSOCIATION
MR. J. WILLIAMS	ONTARIO FEDERATION OF
	ANGLERS & HUNTERS
MR. D. HUNTER	NISHNAWBE-ASKI NATION
	and WINDIGO TRIBAL
	COUNCIL
MR. F. CASTRILLI )	
MS. M. SWENARCHUK)	FORESTS FOR TOMORROW
MR. R. LINDGREN )	
MR. P. SANFORD )	KIMBERLY-CLARK OF CANADA
MS. L. NICHOLLS)	LIMITED and SPRUCE FALLS
MR. D. WOOD )	POWER & PAPER COMPANY
MR. D. MacDONALD	ONTARIO FEDERATION OF
	LABOUR
MR. R. COTTON	BOISE CASCADE OF CANADA
	LTD.
MR. Y. GERVAIS)	ONTARIO TRAPPERS
MR. R. BARNES )	ASSOCIATION
MR. R. EDWARDS )	NORTHERN ONTARIO TOURIST
MR. B. McKERCHER)	OUTFITTERS ASSOCIATION
MR. L. GREENSPOON)	NORTHWATCH
MS. B. LLOYD )	







APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

MR. J. W. ERICKSON)	RED LAKE-EAR FALLS JOINT
MR. B. BABCOCK )	MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE
MR. D. SCOTT )	NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO
MR. J.S. TAYLOR)	ASSOCIATED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE
MR. J.W. HARBELL)	GREAT LAKES FOREST
MR. S.M. MAKUCH )	PRODUCTS
MR. J. EBBS	ONTARIO PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS ASSOCIATION
MR. D. KING	VENTURE TOURISM ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO
MR. D. COLBORNE	GRAND COUNCIL TREATY #3
MR. R. REILLY	ONTARIO METIS & ABORIGINAL ASSOCIATION
MR. H. GRAHAM	CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF FORESTRY (CENTRAL ONTARIO SECTION)
MR. G.J. KINLIN	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
MR. S.J. STEPINAC	MINISTRY OF NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT & MINES
MR. M. COATES	ONTARIO FORESTRY ASSOCIATION
MR. P. ODORIZZI	BEARDMORE-LAKE NIPIGON WATCHDOG SOCIETY
MR. R.L. AXFORD	CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF SINGLE INDUSTRY TOWNS
MR. M.O. EDWARDS	FORT FRANCES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
MR. P.D. MCCUTCHEON	GEORGE NIXON







APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

MR. C. BRUNETTA

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO  
TOURISM ASSOCIATION





I N D E X   O F   P R O C E E D I N G S

<u>Witness:</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
<u>RICHARD M. MONZON,</u> <u>LARRY A. DOUGLAS,</u> Sworn	292
Direct Examination by Mr. Freidin	297





I N D E X   O F   E X H I B I T S

<u>Exhibit No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
5A	Supplementary correspondence to the Formal Review.	292
6	Witness statement of Rick Monzon and Larry Douglas.	293
6A	Supplementary witness statement of Rick Monzon and Larry Douglas.	293
7	Timber Management Planning Manual for Crown Lands in Ontario.	293
8	Document entitled the Northeastern Ontario Strategic Land Use Plan.	294
9	Document entitled the Northwestern Ontario Strategic Land Use Plan.	294
10	Guidelines for Land Use Planning dated 1980 and reprinted in 1982.	294
11	Map of MNR planning regions, administrative regions and districts in the area of the undertaking.	306
12	Local land use planning example.	401
13	Wawa District land use area.	448
5	Review Under the Environmental Assessment Act prepared by ministries and agenices of the Province of Ontario.	486





1       ---Upon commencing at 9:30 a.m.

2                       THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning. Be seated,  
3 please. I see our numbers have thinned out a little  
4 bit.

5                       Ladies and gentlemen, before I forget, I  
6 think that the Board would like to commence tomorrow at  
7 8:30 in the morning and we will probably break no later  
8 than 3:00 p.m.

9                       I understand that the flights leaving  
10 Thunder Bay are between 4:15 and 4:45 to Toronto and  
11 other locations. So that I assume that will give us  
12 all enough time to get from here to the airport.

13                      If we all miss the first flight out, I  
14 think we are here for a while because I understand that  
15 the flights are fairly heavily booked. So we may even  
16 consider leaving a little bit earlier than at three  
17 o'clock.

18                      But, in any event, I think we will try  
19 and get in some kind of routine that on the day we are  
20 flying out, we will start a little earlier in the  
21 morning and we will try and pick up as much hearing  
22 time as we can in that format.

23                      So if we could start at 8:30 tomorrow I  
24 think that would be appropriate.

25                      Mr. Freidin, are you ready to proceed?

1 MR. FREIDIN: Yes, I am.

2 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry.

4 MR. CAMPBELL: Just before Mr. Freidin  
5 does proceed, I would like to just formally file the  
6 Review and the supplementary correspondence which I  
7 spoke of.

8 The Board will recall Exhibit No. 5 was  
9 reserved for the Review, and the box of reviews that we  
10 have been anxious to file seems to me to be continuing  
11 a rather circuitous journey covering every corner of  
12 northern Ontario before it is arriving in Thunder Bay.  
13 I apologize for that, I don't know what has happened,  
14 but we do expect it here today, they are putting a  
15 trace on it and we are sure that it will arrive.

16 I thought, however, if you could wait to  
17 be provided with the copies of the Review, I would  
18 however file the supplementary correspondence knowing  
19 well that most, if not all, of the parties already have  
20 the Review in any event.

21 In filing that supplementary  
22 correspondence, I would like to advise the Board that  
23 it does consist of correspondence and memoranda flowing  
24 from concerns which were raised by various government  
25 ministries in the Review, and on Tuesday, Mr. Freidin



1 provided some parties with copies of some of that  
2 correspondence.

3 I am now in a position to file both the  
4 Review and that supplementary correspondence, but I  
5 would like the Board to note that - and really so that  
6 all parties are aware as well - that in doing that  
7 filing, I have not included correspondence consisting  
8 of one letter between the Ontario Northern Native  
9 Affairs Directorate, ONNAD, and MNR.

10 And my reason for not including that in  
11 the package is because, having spoken to both parties  
12 to that correspondence, there appears to be some  
13 significant differences as to what that letter means,  
14 and, in my submission, it is for those parties to sort  
15 out any confusion which may exist and it would  
16 inappropriate for me to file it at this time and simply  
17 confuse the the matter further.

18 With that said, Mr. Chairman, I would ask  
19 that the supplementary correspondence which we have  
20 copies here be marked as Exhibit No. 5A, reserving 5  
21 for the formal Review.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. That  
23 correspondence will be marked Exhibit 5A and we have  
24 reserved the No. 5 for the Review itself.

25 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

1 and I have copies for other parties.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

3 MR. CAMPBELL: They will no doubt be very  
4 anticlimatic.

5 ---EXHIBIT NO. 5A: Supplementary correspondence to the  
6 formal Review.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin?

8 MR. FREIDIN: It is hard to believe this  
9 is actually happening, Mr. Chairman.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: We will all pretend it is  
11 not.

12 MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, the first  
13 panel is a panel of two, Mr. Rick Monzon and Mr. Larry  
14 Douglas. Perhaps, gentlemen, you could take your --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Could both witnesses -- do  
16 you mind stepping up here to be sworn.

17

18 RICHARD M. MONZON,

19 LARRY A. DOUGLAS, Sworn

20

21 MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps  
22 before beginning the examination of those two witness,  
23 I could file as exhibits documents that relate to this  
24 particular matter, copies of which have been provided  
25 to all the parties.



1                   The first document I would like to file is  
2                   the statement of evidence of this panel.

3                   THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. This witness  
4                   statement will be marked as Exhibit 6.

5           ---EXHIBIT NO. 6: Witness Statement of Rick Monzon and  
6                                   Larry Douglas.

7                   MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't have  
8                   a clean copy of the supplementary witness statement  
9                   with me. I can certainly provide a copy at the first  
10                  break. So can we reserve an exhibit number for that  
11                  document?

12                  THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Exhibit 6A,  
13                  the supplementary witness statement of Panel No. 1.

14           ---EXHIBIT NO. 6A: Supplementary witness statement of  
15                                   Rick Monzon and Larry Douglas.

16                  MR. FREIDIN: The other documents that I  
17                  am going to ask be marked exhibits are ones that were  
18                  filed separately from the witness statement itself, but  
19                  which were referred to in the witness statement or the  
20                  supplementary witness statement.

21                  The first of such documents is the Timber  
22                  Management Planning Manual for Crown Lands in Ontario.

23                  THE CHAIRMAN: Exhibit No. 7

24           ---EXHIBIT NO. 7: Timber Management Planning Manual  
25                                   for Crown Lands in Ontario.

1 MR. FREIDIN: The next document is  
2 entitled the Northeastern Ontario Strategic Land Use  
3 Plan.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Exhibit 8.

5 ---EXHIBIT NO. 8: Document entitled the Northeastern  
6 Ontario Strategic Land Use Plan.

7 MR. FREIDIN: The next document is  
8 entitled Northwestern Ontario Strategic Land Use Plan.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Exhibit No. 9.

10 ---EXHIBIT NO. 9: Document entitled Northwestern  
11 Ontario Strategic Land Use Plan.

12 MR. FREIDIN: The last document is  
13 entitled Guidelines for Land Use Planning 19 -- it is  
14 dated 1980, reprinted in 1982.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Exhibit No. 10.

16 ---EXHIBIT NO. 10: Guidelines for Land Use Planning  
17 dated 1980 and reprinted in 1982.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin, the ones that  
19 were filed will end up being effectively the record  
20 copies. Were you planning to provide the Board with  
21 separate copies of these documents?

22 MR. FREIDIN: Yes. The Board Members?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

24 MR. FREIDIN: Yes, I was. I was under  
25 the understanding that the Board Members did have

1       copies of all these documents.

2                   THE CHAIRMAN:  Of all of these documents?

3                   MR. MANDER:  We have all of them.

4                   THE CHAIRMAN:  The reason I am saying  
5       that is when we go through the examinations here, I  
6       think it would be very helpful for the Board to have  
7       these documents in front of us.

8                   I guess we do not have them--

9                   MR. MANDER:  They are upstairs.

10                  THE CHAIRMAN:  --here today so that we  
11       can follow along in case there are some questions that  
12       we find pertinent.

13                  MR. FREIDIN:  You won't be able to follow  
14       along if you don't have the documents, I don't think,  
15       Mr. Chairman.

16                  The first witness is going to be  
17       referring to portions of them, reading from them, and  
18       directing peoples' attention to certain things in them.

19                  THE CHAIRMAN:  Well, I think perhaps then  
20       it would be appropriate if we just briefly adjourned  
21       for five or ten minutes until we get this document up  
22       here.

23                  MR. FREIDIN:  Yes.

24                  THE CHAIRMAN:  So it can be a meaningful  
25       examination.



1 ---Recess at 9:43 a.m.

2 ---Upon resuming at 9:48 a.m.

3 MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, I have a  
4 clean copy of the supplementary witness statement for  
5 Panel No. 1.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, that will be  
7 Exhibit 6A.

8 MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, the first  
9 witness that I would like to qualify is Mr. Rick  
10 Monzon, M-o-n-z-o-n. You will find a summary or a  
11 brief Curriculum Vitae for Mr. Monzon at page 1 of the  
12 witness statement, and I didn't have a chance to write  
13 down all of the exhibit numbers.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: The witness statement was  
15 Exhibit No. 6.

16 MR. FREIDIN: And you will also find a  
17 more detailed supplement to that Curriculum Vitae at  
18 page 1 or commencing at page 1 of the supplement.

19 The lengthier supplement was prepared  
20 after indication from the Board that you would prefer  
21 that we take as little time as possible in qualifying  
22 witnesses.

23 And so we have attempted to facilitate  
24 that by, I guess, spending a little more time  
25 describing what each of the witness' experience has

1       been.

2       DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FREIDIN:

3                   Q.   Now, Mr. Monzon, I understand that you  
4       graduated from the University of Toronto in 1963 with a  
5       Bachelor of Science Degree in Forestry.

6                   MR. MONZON:   A.   That's correct.

7                   Q.   And that subsequent to your  
8       graduation, you practised as a forester from 1963 until  
9       1969?

10                  A.   That's correct.

11                  Q.   And can you just very briefly  
12       describe the various positions that you held throughout  
13       that period?

14                  A.   Beginning in graduation in 1963, I  
15       worked with the Forest Resources Inventory for a year.

16                  I subsequently worked in southern Ontario  
17       from 1964 through to until about 1967 doing forestry  
18       work in southern Ontario on root lot improvement and  
19       plantation management.

20                  In 1967, I went to northern Ontario to  
21       Kenora and worked in forest management activities in  
22       boreal forests, silvicultural work, regeneration,  
23       timber licensing, et cetera.

24                  THE CHAIRMAN:   Can everybody hear this  
25       witness?

1 MR. MONZON: No.

2 Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I will crank it up.

3 MR. FREIDIN: Q. I understand that from  
4 1969 to 1973 that you were a district planner for the  
5 White River district?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And I assume that's located near  
8 White River, Ontario?

9 A. In the heart of it.

10 Q. And that during that period of time  
11 you were involved in developing a number of local plans  
12 and that for two and a half years during that period  
13 you were assembling and publishing background  
14 information for Lake Superior Provincial Park?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. And, in relation to that particular  
17 exercise, that you actually were co-ordinating the  
18 collection and the documentation for that particular  
19 park?

20 A. That's correct. We were  
21 co-ordinating and determining background information  
22 that was going to be required in the development of a  
23 master plan for that park.

24 Q. And your involvement in developing a  
25 number of local plans, could you very briefly describe



1        what you mean by local plans and give a brief  
2        indication of the sorts of things that are involved?

3                    A.    The local plans at that time - late  
4        1960s, early 1970s - were land use plans that were  
5        being prepared for specific areas of land and water in  
6        northern Ontario where there were specific resource  
7        management conflicts.

8                    Specifically, in the White River  
9        district, for example, we prepared a local land use  
10       plan for Highway 17 to control or direct development to  
11       the appropriate portions along the highway that was  
12       felt that a development should be located at.

13                   As part of that exercise, we were  
14       involved in the collection of background information  
15       relative to travel patterns, relative to concerns of  
16       entrepreneurs in the area, relative to concerns of  
17       people in the area, relative to the aesthetic value of  
18       the highway.

19                   We looked at that information, did some  
20       analysis. We then developed a series of options as to  
21       what sort of planning would be appropriate, where  
22       optional locations for development, and as a result of  
23       that and the result of agreement, would prepare a final  
24       plan.

25                   Q.    I also understand that during your

1 time in the White River district that you were involved  
2 in developing planning theory and methodology which  
3 was, in fact, used in the land use planning exercise  
4 that you are going to be giving evidence about?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. And the land use planning exercise  
7 that you will be giving evidence about took place  
8 between 1972 and 1983?

9 A. That's correct, yes.

10 Q. I understand that from 1973 to 1978  
11 you were the regional lands co-ordinator in the  
12 northcentral region, the northcentral administrative  
13 region of the Ministry of Natural Resources?

14 A. That's correct, and in that position  
15 I was stationed here in Thunder Bay.

16 Q. And during that period of time, did  
17 you continue with the design of the land use planning  
18 methodology which we have already discussed?

19 A. That is correct. As land use  
20 co-ordinator for that region I had, in essence, three  
21 areas of responsibility: land use planning, public  
22 lands administration and mining lands administration.

23 Q. During that time, in terms of your  
24 land use planning responsibilities, were you involved  
25 in things in addition to developing methodology?

1                   Was there any actual land use planning  
2 going on between that period, 1973 to 1978, that you  
3 were involved in?

4                   A. There was some local area planning  
5 going on but, more specifically, we were concerned with  
6 the development of the provincial land use planning  
7 exercise and taking initial steps in getting that  
8 exercise on the road.

9                   Q. In terms of the Northwest Strategic  
10 Land Use Plan which has been filed as an exhibit, did  
11 you have any involvement with that particular document  
12 in the period that I am referring to, 1973 to 1978?

13                  A. Yes, I was directly involved in the  
14 preparation of the background information segment of  
15 that planning exercise, and I was also involved in the  
16 development of the planning options.

17                  Q. I understand that there was public  
18 consultation involved in that particular process?

19                  A. Yes, sir, there was.

20                  Q. Were you involved in that during this  
21 period of time?

22                  A. I was involved in that consultation,  
23 I was involved in the design of it, I was involved in  
24 the participation of it, and I was involved in the  
25 analysis of it.



1 Q. During the period 1978 to 1981, I  
2 understand that you were the Deputy Regional Director  
3 for the northwest administrative region of the Ministry  
4 of Natural Resources?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. And you were stationed in Kenora?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. And that your duties there were  
9 largely administrative in nature?

10 A. Administrative in nature, given  
11 responsibility for the co-ordination of integrated  
12 resource management activities across the region.

13 Q. I understand that you were the  
14 chairman of a task force on park system planning?

15 A. Yes, that's right.

16 Q. Again, briefly could you give the  
17 Board an appreciation of what was involved in that?

18 A. That task force was struck as a  
19 result of -- partially as a result of the completion of  
20 the - if I could use the term - second round of public  
21 consultation in the regional land use planning  
22 exercises which we will talk about in a little bit more  
23 detail later on.

24 The task force work involved an  
25 assessment in bringing up to date in one document the

1 status of park systems planning as it was going on  
2 right across the province, and that information was  
3 utilized in the preparation of a final strategic plan  
4 for the northwest, the northeastern and southern  
5 Ontario, and it was also carried over into the  
6 development of the district land use guidelines.

7 Q. The northwest and the northeastern  
8 documents that you referred to are the two strategic  
9 plans which have been marked as Exhibit 9 and 8  
10 respectively?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. I understand that between 1981 and  
13 1983 that you were the land use planning co-ordinator  
14 for northern Ontario?

15 A. That's right.

16 Q. And what area did that involve?

17 A. That involved responsibility for the  
18 four northern administrative regions in the province.

19 MR. FREIDIN: Perhaps, we could put up a  
20 map, Mr. Chairman. We are going to have to go through  
21 the identification of these regions at some time and  
22 this might be an appropriate time.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

24 That will be marked Exhibit No. 11.

25 MR. FREIDIN: Do you want me to mark

1 anything on there or keep my hands off?

2 THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think you could  
3 write Exhibit 11 somewhere, E-X 11.

4 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Now, Mr. Monzon, I  
5 understand that --

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Freidin.  
7 Do you have a marker of any type there, because I think  
8 the exhibit number is hardly visible from here and I am  
9 sure the others --

10 MR. FREIDIN: I am not sure whether it is  
11 going to stay on here. It seems like a slippery cover.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: That is fine. Thank you.

13 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Now, Mr. Monzon,  
14 throughout the evidence of this panel and later panels  
15 there will be reference to administrative regions of  
16 the Ministry of Natural Resources, planning regions,  
17 which were identified for the strategic land use  
18 exercises that were referred to.

19 Could you identify where the planning  
20 regions are identified or how they are identified on  
21 that particular document?

22 MR. MONZON: A. The planning regions are  
23 identified in the green stripe. There are three of  
24 them: northwestern Ontario, northeastern Ontario and  
25 then the remainder of southern Ontario.



1                   Q. And on that map as well there is an  
2 area which is outlined in red, there is a red line  
3 going across from the left side to the right side of  
4 that document.

5                   What is the area which is bounded by the  
6 red on the top, in the area I have indicated, and sort  
7 of down in the right-hand corner of that document?

8                   A. These two areas are the northern and  
9 southern boundaries of the area of the undertaking.

10                  Q. And can you proximate the area within  
11 that boundary?

12                  A. It is in the order of 385,000 square  
13 kilometres.

14                  Q. Now, the other type of region that we  
15 have referred to are the administrative regions of the  
16 Ministry of Natural Resources. Have you got another  
17 coloured marker there that might work, and perhaps you  
18 could outline those.

19                  THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin, what do you  
20 want to call this exhibit?

21                  MR. FREIDIN: Map indicating planning  
22 regions, administrative regions--

23                  THE CHAIRMAN: In area of the  
24 undertaking?

25                  MR. FREIDIN: --and districts, which I am

1 going to get to next, in the area of the undertaking.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

3

4 ---EXHIBIT NO. 11: Map of MNR planning regions,  
5 administrative regions and  
6 districts in the area of the  
undertaking.

7 MR. MONZON: I have indicated the  
8 northern regions only, Mr. Chairman. I don't think the  
9 regions in southern Ontario are of consequence. I can  
10 do it if you like, but I don't think it matters that  
11 much.

12 There are eight administrative regions in  
13 the province relative to the Ministry of Natural  
14 Resources. I have attempted to outline them in blue -  
15 it has been a few years since I have been doing this  
16 with maps - northwestern region, northcentral, the  
17 northern region which takes in the area of Chapleau,  
18 Gogama, Kirkland Lake and runs up including Moosonee  
19 and right along the James Bay coast; and then the  
20 northeastern region which extends from Wawa through to  
21 North Bay.

22 I suppose, for the purpose of the record,  
23 I should indicate that the northwest extends from the  
24 Manitoba border over to the boundaries of Geraldton,  
25 Nipigon, Thunder Bay, and Atikokan; and the

1 northcentral region moving from that boundary easterly  
2 again to the boundary between Geraldton and Moosonee  
3 and also between Terrace Bay and Hearst and Wawa.

4 MR. FREIDIN: Q. And could you identify  
5 on that map the boundary between the eastern region and  
6 Algonquin region?

7 MR. MONZON: A. The Algonquin region is  
8 the area bordered in green here between the boundary  
9 between North Bay, Parry Sound, Algonquin Park.

10 On the bottom, the southern boundary is  
11 in red between Bracebridge, Huronia, into Lindsay; and  
12 then the blue line is the eastern boundary, for  
13 purposes of the record, between Pembroke and Carleton  
14 Place, between Bancroft and Tweed, between Lindsay and  
15 Napanee.

16 The area in this portion of the map is  
17 Algonquin. (indicating) The area in this portion is the  
18 eastern region. (indicating)

19 Q. You are indicating that the area to  
20 the southeast of the bottom blue line there on that  
21 diagram--

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. --is in the eastern region.

24 And during this evidence you have been  
25 referring to various places like Red Lake, Sioux



1 Lookout, Lindsay.

2 I understand that when you refer to those  
3 names you are referring to administrative districts,  
4 the names of administrative districts within the  
5 Ministry of Natural Resources?

6 A. That's correct. Each of the  
7 administrative regions of the Ministry are further  
8 subdivided into administrative districts. Those are  
9 shown with the black line between the boundaries, and  
10 there is in the order of from six to eight  
11 administrative districts in any one of those regions,  
12 and we will be discussing the makeup and organization  
13 of those entities later on.

14 Q. Thank you, Mr. Monzon.

15 During the period of 1981 to 1983, Mr.  
16 Monzon, I understand that you were the land -- you  
17 indicated that you were the land use planning  
18 co-ordinator for northern Ontario, so that included  
19 which...?

20 A. That included the four northern  
21 regions: The northwest, northcentral, the northern,  
22 and the northeast.

23 Q. And that you were co-ordinating the  
24 preparation of the strategic land use planning  
25 documents for northwestern Ontario and northeastern

1 Ontario at that time as well?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Did you have any involvement in the  
4 co-ordination of district land use guidelines for the  
5 area you have referred to as northern Ontario?

6 A. Yes, I had that responsibility also.

7 Q. And you are going to be giving  
8 evidence in relation to the process used for the  
9 development of those district land use guidelines as  
10 well?

11 A. That's right, we will be doing that a  
12 little later.

13 Q. Now, in 1983, I understand that you  
14 took the position of Director of Policy and Planning  
15 Secretariat at which time you had responsibility for  
16 land use planning activity at the provincial level, and  
17 that you were the co-ordinator of the Ministry's  
18 environmental assessment activity?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And during that period of time, in  
21 that position as co-ordinator of the Ministry's  
22 environmental assessment activity, you were involved in  
23 the presubmission consultations for the draft timber  
24 environmental assessment which has been amended a  
25 number of times and is now before this Board?

1                   A. That's correct. We began those  
2                   presubmission consultation sessions in 1983.

3                   Q. Now, could you just indicate in very  
4                   general terms the types of groups or associations or  
5                   individuals that would have been contacted during that  
6                   public consultation period?

7                   A. We met with representatives of the  
8                   forest industry, we met with members of the  
9                   associations, the association, per se; we met also, I  
10                  believe, with a number of the larger saw mill companies  
11                  in the province; we met with representatives of  
12                  Federation of Ontario Naturalists, I believe; the  
13                  Ontario Federation of Anglers & Hunters; a number of  
14                  the conservation clubs and organizations that had  
15                  provincial concerns.

16                  My estimation would be that in all we  
17                  were meeting in the order of 60 to 80 groups.

18                  Q. I understand in 1984 you became the  
19                  Director of the Forest Resources Branch?

20                  A. That is correct.

21                  Q. And that that Branch was responsible  
22                  for policy and program direction at the provincial  
23                  level in the areas of forest, insect, and disease  
24                  control, forest genetics, regeneration, private land  
25                  forestry, and technology transfer?



1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. What does technology transfer mean?

3 A. Technology transfer is the transfer  
4 of research information and the practical application  
5 of research information from the research scientists to  
6 the practising forester in the field so that the  
7 forester is in a position to use the information,  
8 rather than having the research simply written and  
9 filed and put on a shelf.

10 We were and still are very concerned that  
11 that information and the new techniques be transferred  
12 into the hands of the people who can put it to use.

13 Q. I understand in 1985 you became an  
14 Assistant Deputy Minister for the Ministry of Natural  
15 Resources?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. And could you describe the  
18 responsibilities in that position briefly?

19 A. The Assistant Deputy Minister  
20 Administration is responsible for, in essence, the  
21 administrative support offered by the Ministry of  
22 Natural Resources to, what I would entitle, the program  
23 areas of the organization: the forest group, the  
24 outdoor recreation group, the lands and waters group.

25 Specifically, my responsibilities were in

1 the area of personnel, human resources, finance,  
2 internal audit systems, that sort of thing.

3 Q. And I understand that on February the  
4 15th, 1988 you left the Ministry and assumed a position  
5 with the Management Board of Cabinet.

6 A. That's correct, specifically with the  
7 Human Resources Secretariat.

8 Q. Did you try to get out of being a  
9 witness after February the 15th, 1988?

10 A. I knew nothing as easy as that would  
11 happen as a result of the transfer.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: We do have subpoena  
13 powers, you know that?

14 MR. FREIDIN: Others have fled the  
15 territory.

16 Mr. Douglas' Curriculum Vitae, Mr.  
17 Chairman, again, a short version starting at page 4 of  
18 Exhibit No. 6 and a more lengthy description beginning  
19 at page 8 of Exhibit 6A.

20 Q. Mr. Douglas, I understand that you  
21 graduated from the University of Waterloo in 1971 with  
22 a Masters' Degree in Geography?

23 MR. DOUGLAS: A. That's correct.

24 Q. And that your areas of specialization  
25 were resource management and social science

1 methodology?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Could you give a brief description of  
4 what each of those specializations involved?

5 A. Yes. In the resource management area  
6 I guess my speciality would be in two areas. One was  
7 an interest in water management and the various aspects  
8 of water management, institutional arrangements,  
9 planning for water management, description and analysis  
10 of how it is carried out in various parks.

11 In terms of the social science  
12 methodology, this is various techniques of analyzing  
13 data, attitude surveys, statistical analysis,  
14 projections of, for example, participation rates in  
15 outdoor recreation, that kind of stuff.

16 Q. And I understand that you chaired a  
17 joint research committee of the federal government  
18 which developed publications on the means to undertake  
19 surveys of recreational use and to estimate the  
20 economic impact of parks on regional and provincial  
21 economies during that period 1971 to 1975?

22 A. Yes. From '71 to '75 I  
23 specialized -- carried on my specialty from the  
24 university. I was involved in a number of surveys, for  
25 example, the Ontario Recreation Survey, which was a



1 large survey of 15,000 Ontario residents from which we  
2 identified the various participation rates in canoeing  
3 and camping and golf and everything you can imagine.

4 I was involved to a large degree with the  
5 parks program at that time. Through that  
6 participation, I chaired a research committee of the  
7 Federal/Provincial Parks Conference. During that  
8 period of time, we designed for use across Canada a  
9 manual indicating how to undertake park user surveys.

10 As well, we did a publication for the  
11 federal/provincial ministers in terms of the economic  
12 impacts of parks.

13 As well, during that period, I was the  
14 co-designer of the user surveys for Ontario provincial  
15 parks and was involved in a variety of studies dealing  
16 with the ski industry, for example, boating along the  
17 lakeshore up here. These were primarily interministry  
18 committees.

19 Q. Okay. Now, I understand that that  
20 work then was done between 1971 and 1975?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. So am I correct that you went  
23 directly from the University of Waterloo to the  
24 Ministry of Natural Resources?

25 A. Yes, that's correct.

1 Q. And during the period of 1975 to  
2 1983, that you were a policy officer for the Lands and  
3 Waters Program?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. And in that particular position that  
6 you were involved in a variety of policy development,  
7 including policies for mineral aggregates, flood plane  
8 management, and water diversion?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Were those provincial policies?

11 A. Yes, they were.

12 Q. And what is involved, again in a  
13 general sense, in terms of developing these sorts of  
14 policies?

15 A. Well, development of the provincial  
16 policies involves usually an initial draft being  
17 prepared by one ministry. That draft policy is taken  
18 around to a number of interests, levels of government,  
19 different departments, you get feedback, you go through  
20 a series of revisions, you in effect negotiate out some  
21 of the terms of that policy, you eventually revise it  
22 and you take it to Cabinet for approval.

23 Q. I understand that in developing these  
24 policies you had the opportunity to have contact with a  
25 large number of the other ministries within the Ontario

1 government?

2 A. That's correct. The policies by  
3 their very nature impact upon a number of different  
4 other ministries. So, for example, in flood plane  
5 management, we had a great deal of contact with the  
6 Ministry of the Environment and what is now the  
7 Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Ministry of  
8 Housing.

9 If you take mineral aggregates, you are  
10 again involved with those same ministries. You also  
11 are involved with, for example, the Ministry of  
12 Agriculture which would have to deal with priorities  
13 for mineral aggregates and agricultural use.

14 So when you are dealing with resource  
15 policies of the type you are talking about, you are  
16 continually dealing with a wide variety of different  
17 interests, public interests, a number of different  
18 departments, as well as specialists with different  
19 backgrounds, whether you are talking about engineering,  
20 economics, forestry, biology, whatever.

21 Q. I understand from 1983 to 1985 you  
22 were the Supervisor of the Land Use Planning Branch of  
23 the Ministry and that your responsibilities there  
24 included land use planning and environmental assessment  
25 and the role of the Ministry in municipal planning?

1                   A. That is correct.

2                   Q. Did your involvement at that time --  
3 or your position involve you with any specific projects  
4 which actually are going to be referred to in the  
5 evidence?

6                   A. Yes, a number. In 1983, the  
7 environmental assessment, when I took over that  
8 position, was just going into presubmission  
9 consultation. So I participated in that and, in fact,  
10 have been involved ever since in a variety of different  
11 roles.

12                   A couple of things were undertaken during  
13 that period which is also of significance to the  
14 evidence we will be presenting later on.

15                   In that '83 to '85 period, a review of  
16 integrated resource management in the Ministry was  
17 undertaken under my direct supervision.

18                   Q. I didn't catch the last part of your  
19 response, Mr. Douglas.

20                   Could I ask you, and hopefully I am not  
21 repeating what you have already mentioned, I understand  
22 that you were involved in the production of  
23 a document referred to as the Framework for Resource  
24 Management Planning?

25                   A. Yes. The review of integrated



1 resource management resulted in two documents, in fact.  
2 One is a statement of integrated resource management,  
3 which we will be speaking of later; and the second was  
4 a framework for resource management planning, which I  
5 will present evidence on.

6 Q. Okay. And during the period 1985 to  
7 1987, you were the Director of the Policy Planning  
8 Secretariat of the Ministry and that involved, amongst  
9 other things, co-ordinating the development of policies  
10 again and co-ordination with other ministries?

11 A. Yes. The policy side of policy  
12 planning is the Ministry-wide rule ensuring  
13 co-ordination in the development of policies within the  
14 Ministry, liaison with other ministries, and basically  
15 speaking as the Ministry's voice in discussions with  
16 other ministries on policies they might develop which  
17 could affect our programs.

18 Q. Right. And I understand in September  
19 of 1987 you became the Director of a branch, a new  
20 branch called the Planning and Environmental Assessment  
21 Branch?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. And does that involve you in  
24 environmental assessments more so than you had been  
25 prior to September of '87?

1                   A. It reflects an increased priority  
2 that the Ministry placed on environmental assessment,  
3 in particular the large workload associated with  
4 getting prepared for this hearing.

5                   Q. All right.

6                   MR. FREIDIN: So if I could...

7                   THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to qualify  
8 these witnesses as...

9                   MR. FREIDIN: Well, I would like to  
10 qualify Mr. Monzon as an expert in land use planning  
11 and administration, and Mr. Douglas as an expert in  
12 land use planning, integrated resource management and  
13 policy development.

14                  THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections to these  
15 witnesses being qualified in those areas?

16                   (No response)

17                   They will be so qualified.

18                   MR. FREIDIN: Thank you.

19                   Q. Mr. Monzon, you have identified on  
20 Exhibit No. 11 regions -- administrative regions,  
21 districts, but there is no indication, I believe, on  
22 that particular document of geographical areas which  
23 are referred to as forest management units.

24                   MR. MONZON: A. That's correct.

25                   Q. And am I correct that forest

1 management units, there can be a number of them within  
2 any one of the districts that are outlined on that  
3 particular map and that for each of those forest  
4 management units a timber management plan is prepared  
5 once every five years?

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q. And the preparation of those  
8 particular plans are going to be the subject of  
9 evidence of Panel No. 15?

10 A. That is also correct.

11 Q. I understand there are three  
12 different types of management units?

13 A. That's right. There are some --  
14 within the area of the undertaking there are some 99  
15 forest management units. Within that area, there are  
16 three -- those are broken into three types: a Crown  
17 management unit, a company management unit, and a  
18 forest management agreement management unit.

19 Q. In terms of the preparation of the  
20 plans for those management units, is there a difference  
21 regarding the responsibility for preparation of the  
22 plan based on which type of units you are referring to?

23 A. Yes, there is. On the Crown units,  
24 the Ministry of Natural Resources is the one who  
25 prepares the plan. On the company and forest

1 management agreement management units, the forest  
2 company involved prepares the plan.

3 Q. And who approves the plans for all of  
4 those management units?

5 A. The Ministry of Natural Resources.

6 Q. Does the Ministry staff become  
7 involved in the actual implementation or the carrying  
8 out of the activities that in fact constitute timber  
9 management?

10 A. Yes, they become involved more  
11 particularly on the Crown management units of those  
12 activities.

13 I think it is probably useful to just  
14 again, for the record, indicate that those records and  
15 those activities involve access to the timber, it  
16 involves -- involves timber harvesting, they involve  
17 the regeneration, both the site preparation and actual  
18 regeneration activity; and they also involve  
19 maintenance, which is the tending of the new forest and  
20 the protection from insects and disease.

21 Now, of those activities on Crown units,  
22 the Ministry would be involved in all but the  
23 harvesting aspect.

24 Q. And, in general terms, could you  
25 describe the level of involvement of Crown employees,



1 employees of the Ministry of Natural Resources, in  
2 those activities in comparison to company personnel on  
3 the other types of units?

4 A. Well, on the Crown units, the  
5 Ministry employees would be directly involved in the,  
6 if you want, on-site supervision of the activity, and  
7 ensuring that the activity was being carried out to the  
8 standards and guidelines that were set relative to a  
9 particular type of site preparation, for an example.

10 On the company and the forest management  
11 units, the role is one of monitoring to ensure that the  
12 work is done. There is not the on-the-ground  
13 supervision as to how it is being done, but there is a  
14 significant role in terms of audit or monitoring in  
15 terms of its adherence to standards.

16 Q. Right. And that auditing and  
17 monitoring would be the subject matter of a later  
18 panel, I understand?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. In terms of percentages, are the  
21 companies involved more in actually implementing the  
22 activities in comparison to the Crown employees?

23 A. Oh, yes, yes, significantly more.  
24 The industry would be involved in the order of some 70  
25 per cent I would estimate.

1 Q. And in light of that, what was the  
2 basis for the Ministry of Natural Resources becoming  
3 the proponent?

4 A. The basis for the Ministry being the  
5 proponent for this undertaking is the fact that the  
6 Ministry is responsible for the approval of the forest  
7 management plans prepared under the Crown Timber Act.

8 There is no legislative authority under  
9 the Crown Timber Act for the Ministry to delegate that  
10 responsibility further and to delegate it to the  
11 private sector.

12 MRS. KOVEN: Excuse me, Mr. Monzon. I  
13 wasn't clear about the 70 per cent you were talking  
14 about. Did that refer to the total involvement of  
15 companies in the 99 management units or within the  
16 company in FMA units?

17 MR. MONZON: The 70 per cent refers to  
18 the percentage of the total in, if you want, hands-on  
19 involvement relative to access, relative to  
20 regeneration, relative to timber.

21 The companies would be involved in some  
22 70 per cent of the actual on-the-ground work, where the  
23 Ministry employees would be involved in the order of 30  
24 per cent of that type of work on Crown units, being  
25 actually on site and doing it.

1                   MR. MARTEL: Could I just ask what the  
2                   figures would be then in an FMA, or are they somewhat  
3                   reversed?

4                   MR. MONZON: On the FMA, the situation  
5                   would be almost a hundred per cent, would be a hundred  
6                   per cent industry.

7                   MR. FREIDIN: I think there is some  
8                   confusion here.

9                   Q. Mr. Monzon, the 70 per cent and the  
10                  30 per cent, I understand that you were looking at the  
11                  geographical area, the whole area of the undertaking?

12                  A. Whole area of the undertaking, yes.

13                  Q. You were saying in that whole area 70  
14                  per cent of the--

15                  MRS. KOVEN: Yes, I understand.

16                  MR. FREIDIN: Q. --hands-on activities  
17                  were carried out by company people and 30 per cent were  
18                  carried out by Crown?

19                  MR. MONZON: A. Yes, that's correct.

20                  Q. And I understand as well, that third  
21                  parties, people other than the company that is licensed  
22                  for that area, that management FMA unit, or other than  
23                  Crown employees, could also become involved in those  
24                  activities--

25                  A. Yes.

1 Q. --through contractual arrangements?

2 A. That's right, that's right.

3 Q. Mr. Monzon, could you turn to the  
4 first document which is attached to the witness  
5 statement, it is found at page 33 of Exhibit No. 6.  
6 What is that document, Mr. Monzon?

7 MR. MONZON: A. That is a list of the  
8 general statutes that are administered by the Ministry  
9 of Natural Resources.

10 Q. And what was the purpose of producing  
11 that list?

12 A. The purpose of producing that list  
13 was to indicate to the Board the variety of resource  
14 management responsibilities that the Ministry of  
15 Natural Resources has by virtue of legislation.

16 Q. And what are the resources that it  
17 has management responsibilities for and which are dealt  
18 with by that myriad of statutes?

19 A. There is a very wide variety. If you  
20 like I could give you some -- I think the easiest way  
21 would be for me to give you some examples.

22 In terms of the timber resource, the  
23 Crown Timber Act is an example of legislation that  
24 relates to that. In terms of fisheries, which the  
25 Ministry also has responsibility for, the Fisheries Act



1       which is listed in the statute is an example of the  
2       legislative authority.

3               The Ministry also has responsibility for  
4       wildlife and there are a number of statutes here. The  
5       Migratory Birds Act is perhaps an example of the type  
6       of involvement there.

7               In terms of public land, the Public Lands  
8       Act is the broad piece of legislation under which the  
9       Ministry operates the administration of public land in  
10      the province.

11              The Ministry also has responsibilities  
12      for water, for water management and an example would be  
13      Lake of the Woods Control Board Act which is part of  
14      the, I guess, international joint commission  
15      responsibilities in Lake of the Woods.

16              The Ministry also has responsibilities  
17      for parks. The Provincial Parks Act is probably the  
18      most common piece of legislation there; however, there  
19      are a number of others.

20              The Ministry also has responsibilities  
21      for aggregates. Pits and Quarries Control Act may be a  
22      piece of legislation that perhaps Members of the Board  
23      have had some familiarity with in the past.

24              And finally, a little known but important  
25      area, petroleum, oil and gas in the Petroleum Resources

1 Act is the enabling legislation.

2 I think, Mr. Chairman, the point in all  
3 of this is that there are a wide variety of resources  
4 that the Ministry is responsible for. There is a  
5 significant body of legislation relating to those  
6 resources and the administration of that legislation  
7 and the management of those resources is one of the  
8 great challenges of the Ministry and that is now met  
9 in - I think Mr. Freidin has referred to it earlier -  
10 in the variety of staff and disciplines that the  
11 Ministry has from foresters to biologists to lands  
12 technicians, what have you, right across.

13 Q. You refer to this particular -- the  
14 number of resources as a challenge to the Ministry.  
15 What do you mean by that?

16 A. Well, the challenge is in optimizing  
17 the benefits that flow from the resources and the  
18 management of those resources on any particular piece  
19 of land, to optimize those benefits for the greater  
20 good of the local residents in the area, for the  
21 people, and for any commercial interests that are  
22 involved, recognizing that on that same piece of land  
23 there are going to be conflicts, there are going to be  
24 different and opposing points of view, and the  
25 challenge for the Ministry is to maximize those

1       benefits and minimize those conflicts.

2                   MR. MARTEL: I have a question. There is  
3       a whole series of Acts that involve mining. Is that  
4       going to be transferred out of your responsibility to  
5       the new ministry that was created?

6                   MR. MONZON: There are portions of those  
7       Acts that are still relative to the Ministry of Natural  
8       Resources because of the fact that aggregate sand and  
9       gravel still remains the responsibility of the Ministry  
10      of Natural Resources.

11                   So in terms of, for example, listing the  
12      Mining Act, we have made reference to specific sections  
13      which are relevant to this Ministry.

14                   MR. MARTEL: Okay.

15                   MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, who within  
16      the Ministry is assigned the task of administering  
17      these statutes and, more particularly, the resources to  
18      which they refer?

19                   MR. MONZON: A. Well, specifically  
20      within the Ministry initially, that responsibility is  
21      assigned to the Minister then, through enabling  
22      legislation, the responsibilities are delegated down to  
23      the appropriate level in the Ministry and specifically  
24      from the Minister to the Deputy to the program areas at  
25      the executive co-ordinator level.

1 Q. All right. What are you referring to  
2 when you say the program levels?

3 A. If I might, Mr. Chairman, if I could  
4 just use the overhead that might help a little bit.

5 No, I can't do that because we don't have  
6 one, sorry.

7 Let me refer you to page --

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Were you arranging for one  
9 or did you want the Board to make arrangements for an  
10 overhead or...?

11 MR. MONZON: That's my mistake, Mr.  
12 Chairman. I thought I had one but I don't. I can do  
13 without it.

14 MR. FREIDIN: He just didn't have the  
15 transparencies.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. We have the  
17 machine.

18 MR. MONZON: We have the machine.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

20 MR. MONZON: On page 249 of the witness  
21 statement, there is an organizational chart entitled  
22 Ministry of Natural Resources Organizational Chart -  
23 Main and Regional Offices.

24 I can deal with this a little bit later  
25 in some more detail, but for the purposes of the



1 question that is put to me, the focus is on the centre  
2 lower portion of the organizational chart.

3 You will see, if you follow down from the  
4 top, from the Minister to the Deputy and then down  
5 through to three executive co-ordinators for the Forest  
6 Resources Program, Outdoor Recreation and Lands &  
7 Waters, and that is the level of delegation that I was  
8 referring to.

9 MR. FREIDIN: Q. So the programs that  
10 you referred to include the Forest Resources Program,  
11 the Outdoor Recreation Program and the Lands & Waters  
12 Programs?

13 MR. MONZON: A. Yes. And, in addition,  
14 there is the Administration Program but, as I  
15 indicated, that acts in a support role.

16 Q. Could you outline the  
17 responsibilities and the sorts of things that each of  
18 those programs deal with?

19 A. Yes, I can certainly do that. I  
20 think for ease of following, I would refer the Board  
21 back to page 9 of the witness statement, and I think in  
22 order to start to look at the responsibilities of the  
23 program, it is first necessary to look at the goal of  
24 the Ministry of Natural Resources and that is shown in  
25 paragraph 4 of page 9.

1                   Having in mind, Mr. Chairman, your  
2                   acknowledgment earlier not to read verbatim, I will try  
3                   not to do that.

4                   The goal is stated -- I would highlight  
5                   the words "opportunity", I would highlight the words  
6                   "continuous economic and social benefit for the people  
7                   of Ontario" and I would also highlight the words  
8                   "development and conservation of Ontario's natural  
9                   resources".

10                  As indicated in the text, that goal is  
11                  directed to ministry programs into three areas. First  
12                  of all, stimulating the development of the natural  
13                  resources, the resource conservation and, defining  
14                  public safety.

15                  Going on from that goal, we move to the  
16                  four program areas as we have discussed earlier:  
17                  Forest resources, outdoor recreation, land and waters  
18                  and administration. And these are found on page 10 and  
19                  11 of the witness statement.

20                  Again, having regard, Mr. Chairman, to  
21                  try not to read verbatim, I think it is important to --  
22                  and we will start with the forest program in paragraph  
23                  6 - it is important to note that the program has  
24                  responsibility both on Crown lands and private lands,  
25                  but recognizing that the purpose of this undertaking

1 deals with the Crown lands.

2 The objective, I think, of the program  
3 there I believe is worth reading:

4 "To provide for an optimum continuous  
5 contribution to the economy by the  
6 forest based industries and to provide  
7 for other uses of the forest through  
8 environmentally sound timber management  
9 practices."

10 I would stress, Mr. Chairman, for the  
11 Board that the phraseology after the term "and" because  
12 the reference to the "environmentally sound timber  
13 management practices" reflects a desire of this  
14 Ministry to continually improve the practices that are  
15 undertaken in forest management within the context of a  
16 sound and healthy environment.

17 The outdoor recreation program. Moving on  
18 in paragraph 7, the management responsibilities are  
19 listed there: fisheries, wildlife, provincial parks,  
20 recreational areas, recreational boating.

21 To describe those briefly: Fisheries  
22 involves the maintenance and harvesting of the  
23 fisheries resource, both from the commercial and sports  
24 fishing standpoint. The Ministry is involved in all  
25 aspects of fisheries management from habitat

1 improvements to enforcement and to working with the  
2 number of private organizations in support of improved  
3 fisheries, habitat and improved increase in fish  
4 populations.

5 The same applies to wildlife. A direct --  
6 a relationship between the Ministry and a number of  
7 private organizations dedicated to the improvement of  
8 wildlife habitat and the increasing in some areas of  
9 the province specific species.

10 The Ministry again is involved in the  
11 management of herds, the management of populations, and  
12 also in the aspects of enforcement and also in the - I  
13 am searching for the right word - the best utilization  
14 of the species or the moose --

15 Q. You may not find the word.

16 A. I was going to ask the Chairman if  
17 lapses of memory are common in this situation.

18 What I am referring to is that we have  
19 recently undertaken - not recently, a number of years  
20 ago - undertook an initiative, particularly with the  
21 tourist industry in northern Ontario relative to moose  
22 population.

23 As you are probably aware, the Ministry  
24 operates a tag system for moose and the decision was  
25 made that a percentage or a portion of all of the tags



1       that would be available for hunting would be given to  
2       the tourist industry for their moose. So that's what I  
3       was trying to get at, that splitting off of a portion  
4       of the resource for a particular user group.

5                   Q. Is there some benefit seen in doing  
6       that?

7                   A. Well, certainly from the standpoint  
8       of the tourist industry there is a significant benefit,  
9       and in terms of the economic benefit to the province,  
10      there is a significant economic benefit.

11                   There is also the social aspect given  
12      that the tourist association -- northern Ontario  
13      tourist operators deal, not only with out-of-province  
14      clients, but to some degree to in-province clients too.

15                   Provincial parks, I don't think I need to  
16      say very much about that. I think that is probably  
17      very familiar to you all.

18                   Recreation areas, it is sort of a subset  
19      of provincial parks. Again, recreational boating is a  
20      small program within the Ministry that is really  
21      focused on boating safety.

22                   Again, if I can come back now, having  
23      described the program briefly, to look at the  
24      objectives. Again, I would make the point, in terms of  
25      the responsibilities from both private -- or Crown and

1 private lands and waters, looking at the provision of a  
2 variety of outdoor recreation opportunities which are  
3 both accessible to and for the people of Ontario.

4 So we are looking there at making  
5 recreational opportunities available where they will do  
6 the most good. It doesn't do a lot of good to have a  
7 number of highly exciting recreational opportunities  
8 500 miles from a population centre, so that is the  
9 sense it that.

10 And continuous benefit for the people of  
11 Ontario involves not only the social impact of having  
12 that opportunity available, but also the economic  
13 impact through tourism.

14 The second part of the objective is the  
15 identification and conservation of unique or  
16 representative physical, biological, cultural and  
17 historical features of the province, a specific  
18 objective of the recreational program and probably best  
19 known through the ANSI Program of the Ministry, which  
20 is areas of natural and scientific interest.

21 Q. ANSI is A-N-S-I?

22 A. Sorry, I was admonished not to do  
23 that. The final --

24 Q. Before you pass on from that area,  
25 could you, perhaps in a general way, indicate what you

1 mean by unique or representative features?

2 A. We are looking at plant communities,  
3 specific plant species, specific geological or  
4 geomorphological features of the landscape which will  
5 be rare or unique to Ontario features, features such as  
6 that.

7 Q. I understand that in some cases parks  
8 of some sort are created in order to protect or manage  
9 some of these areas?

10 A. That's right. As I recall, there was  
11 a specific objective in the parks system that relates  
12 to the protection and conservation of these types of  
13 features.

14 Q. And the term that you used where  
15 these things are identified and called ANSIs, am I  
16 correct that those areas are areas which are outside  
17 the type of park that you referred to?

18 A. That's correct, those are areas that  
19 are outside of the provincial park system.

20 You could have areas -- you could have a  
21 plant community, for example, that is located on  
22 private land. In that instance, the Ministry would  
23 attempt to work out an arrangement with the landowner  
24 which protected the community and yet, if it was  
25 appropriate, allowed for the appropriate scientific or

1 of the technical research that went on.

2 MR. MARTEL: Would that include wetlands?

3 MR. MONZON: It could include wetlands or  
4 certainly portions thereof, yes. You are thinking, I  
5 presume, of the wetlands -- yes.

6 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Of the wetlands --  
7 yes...? Well, in the transcript -- Mr. Martel and you  
8 may know what you are talking about, but...

9 MR. MONZON: A. I guess we have to tell  
10 them.

11 Q. Just finish off.

12 A. We are referring to a categorization  
13 of wetlands across the province that has been an  
14 undertaking. I believe - this is outside my field of  
15 expertise - but I believe it is on a one to seven  
16 scale. Mr. Douglas may be more -- have more knowledge  
17 on this than I do.

18 MR. FREIDIN: Would you like any more  
19 elaboration on that, Mr. Martel?

20 MR. MARTEL: I think it includes that.  
21 Thank you.

22 MR. FREIDIN: Thank you.

23 Q. And the last part of that  
24 objective...

25 MR. MONZON: A. Continuous contribution



1 to the economy of Ontario, again, from tourism and its  
2 related industries, and that is -- the reference to  
3 tourism is through the spinoff effect of the provincial  
4 park system and recreational areas where tourists come  
5 in to the province from other provinces and from the  
6 U.S. and, indeed, to northern Ontario from southern  
7 Ontario and utilize the park system.

8 And, in addition, when they are in the  
9 area they utilize tourist establishments and hunting  
10 licences, fishing licences, et cetera.

11 So both the Ministry of Natural Resources  
12 and the Ministry of Tourism have, if you want, a shared  
13 objective in that regard.

14 Q. The last one -- the last program  
15 exclusive of the administrative program is the Lands &  
16 Waters Program, Mr. Monzon?

17 A. Again, both Crown and private land  
18 concerns, specifically related to Crown lands and water  
19 resources. That does not sound right.

20 The Lands & Waters Program has many  
21 responsibilities relative to Crown lands - and we have  
22 talked about the Public Lands Act - specific  
23 responsibility for water resources - and that's a  
24 shared responsibility with the Ministry of  
25 Environment - responsibility for mineral aggregate,

1       petroleum, forest fire protection and also surveys and  
2       mapping.

3                       The specific objective of the program is  
4       orderly development, wise use - this is all in  
5       paragraph 9 of our witness statement - of those  
6       resources to both the social and economic benefit of  
7       the people of Ontario and protection for life and  
8       property from fire, flood and erosion hazard.

9                       Q.   Could you expand a little bit, Mr.  
10       Monzon, on the reference to water resources which is  
11       indicated as being a shared mandate with the Ministry  
12       of the Environment?

13                      A.   The Ministry of Natural Resources has  
14       responsibility for water quantity. The Ministry of the  
15       Environment has responsibility for water quality.

16                      Q.   And what is involved in having  
17       responsibility or managing water quantity?

18                      A.   Managing water quantity, you will  
19       have heard at the very macro level the concerns which  
20       were expressed about a year ago relative to the  
21       potential selling of the water resource in Ontario to  
22       the U.S., and there was a conference -- a provincial  
23       conference a number of years ago involving the Province  
24       of Ontario and, I believe, a number of -- all of the  
25       states bordering on the Great Lakes at which an accord

1 was reached that dealt with the issue of water  
2 quantity.

3 On the more specific aspects of water  
4 quantity which are carried out, if I can use the term  
5 on a day-to-day basis by the Ministry, the Ministry has  
6 a responsibility for a number of dams which are located  
7 on Crown lands throughout the province, and with the  
8 responsibility of those dams comes the responsibility  
9 for control of inflow, outflow and water quality and  
10 water levels on a number of the lakes and rivers.

11 Q. Mr. Monzon, you described the Forest  
12 Resources Program -- three programs. Which one of  
13 those has the responsibility for management of the  
14 timber resource on Crown lands in Ontario?

15 A. The forest program has the  
16 responsibility.

17 I think I should say, Mr. Chairman, if I  
18 might - and just to try to conclude this portion,  
19 because I am from administration and I want to get it  
20 in - it is paragraphs 10 and 11 of the witness  
21 statement, I won't read thoses, but simply to reiterate  
22 that the objective of that administration program is  
23 the provision of essential administrative services to  
24 those other programs.

25 I think the other point I would like to

1 make is that, in terms of the totality of the goals and  
2 objectives of the various Ministry programs, I think it  
3 should be evident that the overriding concern of the  
4 Ministry programs is not one of exploitation, it is not  
5 one of simply straight economic benefit.

6 Just about, and I believe all, of the  
7 program objectives reference the social aspects and the  
8 social benefits that we should be mindful of, they all  
9 reference conservation and protection.

10 And I think, to come back to the subject  
11 under discussion here, timber management, the term --  
12 and I would refer back to page 10 in the Forest  
13 Resources Program objective again:

14 "...provide for other uses through  
15 environmentally sound timber management  
16 practices."

17 Is a phrase that was put in very conscientiously when  
18 the objective of this program was determined.

19 Q. Mr. Monzon, is there a reason for  
20 having a statement or a formal statement of goals and  
21 objectives of the type that we have just dealt with?

22 A. Oh very much so. Two prime purposes:  
23 One to provide a very clear indication to the  
24 stakeholders and the general public of Ontario as to  
25 the mandate and the responsibilities and the intent of



1 the Ministry of Natural Resources, what those programs  
2 are designed to do and the benefits which they are  
3 designed to achieve.

4 And on the other side, there is a very  
5 real need to make sure that the staff of the Ministry  
6 of Natural Resources and, indeed, the staff of other  
7 ministries and agencies are aware of the objectives  
8 that the Ministry is trying to achieve and the benefits  
9 that could accrue.

10 Q. Are the goals and objectives always  
11 as general in nature as the ones that you have referred  
12 to?

13 A. Not always. Given the fact that we  
14 are talking at this level about goals and objectives  
15 which relate to a program which is going to be  
16 implemented across Ontario, the goals and objectives  
17 are very general.

18 As one moves from a provincial level, for  
19 example, through to a regional level, then down to a  
20 district and then down to a specific lake, for example,  
21 or forest management unit within a district, the  
22 objectives become very much more specific. We will be  
23 talking, I believe, about that a little later.

24 Q. Could I refer you to document No. 2  
25 which you will find at page 35 of Exhibit 6.

1                   Could you describe that document, Mr.  
2 Monzon, and explain why in fact it was prepared?

3                   A. This document as entitled on page 35  
4 is a summary of the status of the Ministry activities  
5 under the Environmental Assessment Act and indicates a  
6 very great number of activities that the Ministry  
7 carries out, the way in which they are being treated  
8 under the Environmental Assessment Act through  
9 exemptions or class environmental assessments or what  
10 have you.

11                  Q. And for whom was this prepared?

12                  A. This was prepared, first of all, for  
13 this hearing to provide evidence, Mr. Chairman, to the  
14 Board that the activities of this Ministry are covered  
15 and are subject to the Environmental Assessment Act.

16                  It was also prepared - not in this form -  
17 it has been prepared before for the purposes of staff  
18 of the Ministry so that the staff that are in the  
19 regions and district that are responsible for carrying  
20 out the programs are aware of their responsibility  
21 under the Environmental Assessment Act in the carrying  
22 out of their programs.

23                  Q. Now, is there a reference in this  
24 document, Mr. Monzon, to the coverage of forest  
25 management on Crown land in forest management units?

1           A. Yes, there is. That reference is  
2 found on page 36 of the witness statement, the second  
3 item from the top.

4           Q. And I understand the full text of  
5 that particular document is found in the supplementary  
6 witness statement at page No. 36?

7           A. That is correct -- I am sorry?

8           Q. No, it is not --

9           A. Page 18 I believe.

10          Q. Page 18, yes.

11          Am I correct, Mr. Monzon, that this is  
12 the exemption order which applied to what was described  
13 as forest management up until -- is presently in  
14 effect?

15          A. That's correct.

16          Q. Could I refer you to Paragraph 8,  
17 that's on page 22 of this supplement and it states  
18 that:

19                "If a class environmental assessment for  
20 forest management has been submitted by  
21 the Ministry of Natural Resources  
22 before December the 31st, 1985, this  
23 order shall remain in effect until a  
24 decision on approval is made with respect  
25 to the class environmental assessment,

1 but if such an environmental assessment  
2 is not submitted, this order shall cease  
3 to apply on December the 31st, 1985."

4 The document refers specifically to a  
5 class environmental assessment in relation to forest  
6 management, Mr. Monzon. Could you advise, has the  
7 Ministry in fact done that, in the view of the  
8 Ministry?

9 A. Yes, in view of the Ministry, the  
10 Ministry has complied with that direction.

11 Q. Why the change in the name from  
12 forest management to timber management?

13 A. The reason for the change goes back  
14 to presubmission consultations which were started in  
15 1983, and at that point we became quite concerned about  
16 the perception that there was with the stakeholders who  
17 were interested in this class environmental assessment  
18 as to their understanding of the scope of the  
19 undertaking.

20 Q. What did you perceive their  
21 misunderstanding to be?

22 A. Their misunderstanding, in our view,  
23 was the definition, if you want, of the term forest  
24 management. Certainly, the perception was that -- the  
25 people that we talked to were taking a very broad view



1 of the term forest management and interpreting that to  
2 include such activities as hunting, fishing, camping,  
3 et cetera, a whole series of activities that would take  
4 place in the forest in addition to the specific timber  
5 management activities which we were particularly  
6 interested in seeing being looked at under the class  
7 environmental assessment process.

8 Q. Could you comment then on what the  
9 intention of the Ministry was in preparing and  
10 submitting the document?

11 A. Well certainly, Mr. Chairman, it was  
12 never the intention of the Ministry to submit a class  
13 environmental assessment on that broad a scale.

14 It was always the intention to deal with  
15 those activities which we are dealing with today under  
16 timber management, the access to the harvest, the  
17 regeneration, and the maintenance.

18 Q. Now, on what basis, Mr. Monzon, are  
19 you able to give that evidence, and I refer to the  
20 evidence as to what the intention of the Ministry of  
21 Natural Resources was or always was in relation to the  
22 scope of the class environmental assessment?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin, is it not of  
24 some consequence as well what the view of the Ministry  
25 of the Environment is with respect to those two

1 definitions, because it is the Ministry of the  
2 Environment's exemption order; is it not?

3 MR. FREIDIN: I think it would be  
4 certainly important to understand what their view is  
5 and it is my understanding that--

6 THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, what I am  
7 saying is --

8 MR. FREIDIN: --they are in agreement  
9 with the approach in terms of forest management versus  
10 timber management as it has been characterized by many  
11 people.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: And I don't suppose, Mr.  
13 Campbell, can add anything to do that?

14 MR. CAMPBELL: Not at this time, Mr.  
15 Chairman.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You see what I am  
17 getting at, basically the Ministry of the Environment  
18 has --

19 MR. CAMPBELL: Just so there is  
20 absolutely no misunderstanding in making that comment.  
21 I don't want to be taken as endorsing or not endorsing  
22 the interpretation that these witnesses and Mr. Freidin  
23 has put upon us.

24 I am clearly going to have to speak to  
25 the Ministry and obtain instructions.

1                   THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Because it appears  
2 to the Board, I think, that when we have an exemption  
3 order which uses particular language - and it is, in  
4 effect, a result of an order of a particular ministry -  
5 the ministry to which that order affects then goes on  
6 and takes on a particular interpretation of the wording  
7 used therein, I think it is important as well to have  
8 an understanding of what the ministry who made the  
9 order also thinks the same wording means.

10                   If it is in accord with what the Ministry  
11 of Natural Resources thinks it means, well and good; if  
12 it is not, I do not know what the implications of that  
13 are at this point, but I think it is something we  
14 perhaps should clarify at an early stage.

15                   MR. FREIDIN: I am just wondering whether  
16 Mr. Douglas can perhaps just comment on this matter  
17 before I continue the examination of Mr. Monzon.

18                   MR. DOUGLAS: The Government Review,  
19 including the Review from MOE, commented on that and  
20 not to put any interpretation on it, MOE's view is  
21 recorded in there.

22                   THE CHAIRMAN: In the Government Review?

23                   MR. DOUGLAS: Yes.

24                   THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

25                   MR. FREIDIN: Q. Now, just going back to

1 the question that I asked you before we got into that  
2 discussion, you had given evidence that it was always  
3 the Ministry's intention that the class environmental  
4 assessment which was referred to in the exemption order  
5 was, in fact, timber management as it has been defined  
6 in this particular Environmental Assessment document?

7 MR. MONZON: A. That's correct.

8 Q. And I asked you on what basis that  
9 you were able to say that that was the Ministry's view?

10 A. I guess the most significant basis  
11 would be the fact that certainly up until and after  
12 1983, the Ministry had been complying with the  
13 Environmental Assessment Act relative to particular  
14 activities of the Ministry, and I have referred to it  
15 for you again at pages 35 to 38 of the witness  
16 statement which records the particular activities that  
17 the Ministry was dealing with and it had dealt with  
18 under the Act.

19 Things like solid waste, access points  
20 and docks, dams and dikes all received class  
21 environmental -- class environmental assessments which  
22 were approved by the Ministry of the Environment.

23 My point, Mr. Chairman, is that we were  
24 approaching the adherence to the Environmental  
25 Assessment Act on the basis of activities, very



1 specific activities, and it was on that basis that we  
2 were proceeding and wanted to maintain that direction.

3 Q. Could you comment on the  
4 significance -- you referred to a number -- or two or  
5 three orders or exemptions in relation to things other  
6 than what you described as timber management.

7 What is the significance that you are  
8 attaching to the fact that those types of things appear  
9 in the document No. 2 which starts on page No. 45.

10 A. The significance, again, Mr.  
11 Chairman, would be that those were specific activities  
12 and those were activities that would be taking place in  
13 the forests at the same time as timber management.

14 To this point in time we had been dealing  
15 with those on an activity-by-activity basis and that  
16 was the our understanding as to the way we were always  
17 going to be proceeding.

18 Q. And was it the Ministry's view and is  
19 it the Ministry's view today that those other  
20 activities, those activities other than what you have  
21 described as timber management - and perhaps others  
22 which appear in this list - would be included in an  
23 undertaking if an undertaking was defined to be forest  
24 management in the wider scope -- the wider definition,  
25 if I can say, of that term?

1                   A. That's correct. That's correct.

2                   Q. What was your position, Mr. Monzon,  
3 at the time that the draft environmental assessment was  
4 submitted to the Ministry of the Environment?

5                   A. The assessment was submitted in June,  
6 1985. At that point I was an Assistant Deputy Minister  
7 Administration.

8                   Q. All right. And did you have any  
9 involvement in the preparation or the contents of the  
10 draft Environmental Assessment document.

11                  A. Yes, I did. Immediately prior to the  
12 position of Assistant Deputy Minister I had been  
13 Director of the Forest Resources Branch. At that point  
14 I had been -- had the primary responsibility within the  
15 branch for dealing with the class environmental  
16 assessment.

17                  Prior to that, as you pointed out  
18 earlier, I was the Director of Policy and Planning  
19 Secretariat which had the overall responsibility for  
20 the co-ordination of the Ministry's environmental  
21 assessment activities.

22                  Q. Now, Mr. Monzon, I think you may have  
23 said that you had those responsibilities in 1985 and  
24 maybe I didn't hear you -- maybe I heard you correctly,  
25 maybe I didn't -- when was it you had responsibilities

1 in relation to the Environmental Assessment Act?

2 A. '83 and '84.

3 Q. Is it during that period that you  
4 were involved in the preparation of the draft--

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. --environmental assessment?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And that draft environmental  
9 assessment was submitted and is dated 1983?

10 A. Oh, I am sorry. I am sorry.

11 Q. Am I correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 MRS. KOVEN: Excuse me. Does the draft  
14 environmental assessment have the categories of  
15 exemptions of activities in it?

16 MR. MONZON: I don't believe it would  
17 have. I am taking a guess. We would have to check for  
18 you. We can do that.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

20 MR. FREIDIN: Perhaps if the request  
21 could be made clear, so I know what we are looking for.

22 MRS. KOVEN: Okay. I was wondering,  
23 talking about the draft assessment in June 1983.

24 MR. FREIDIN: Yes.

25 MRS. KOVEN: And I was wondering if the

1 summary of the status of various activities that MNR  
2 has listed here as being exempt from the assessment we  
3 are looking at now, if there was some mention of that  
4 in that draft?

5 MR. MONZON: In all, I would have to take  
6 a guess. We would have to get back to you on the  
7 specifics of that.

8 MR. FREIDIN: Q. So you understand the  
9 question, Mr. Monzon, and you know what you are going  
10 to be looking for?

11 MR. MONZON: A. That's correct.

12 MR. FREIDIN: Q. All right, that is  
13 fine.

14 MRS. KOVEN: I can explain it to you  
15 again, Mr. Freidin.

16 What I would like to see is -- here I am  
17 a little bit confused by what is referred to as  
18 exempted activities by the Ministry of Natural  
19 Resources.

20 For example, I don't know what  
21 temporarily exempt means. I really don't understand it  
22 very well, and I was wondering if these exemptions took  
23 place only after 1985 - but they don't seem to be  
24 because some on the list are dated 1982 - and I was  
25 wondering where this idea that certain activities would



1 be outside an environmental assessment began to take  
2 place in the Ministry.

3 MR. FREIDIN: All right, within the  
4 Ministry of Natural Resources?

5 MRS. KOVEN: Yes.

6 MR. FREIDIN: Okay.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin, I think it is  
8 now an appropriate time to take the morning break.

9 MR. FREIDIN: And I am really nervous  
10 about my estimate of time.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will return at  
12 11:30.

13 ---Recess taken at 11:10 a.m.

14 ---Upon resuming at 11:30 a.m.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies and  
16 gentlemen. Please be seated.

17 Mr. Campbell?

18 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Board  
19 has asked me to clarify a matter at an early stage and  
20 I will do so, although not now.

21 I may be dreadfully embarrassed by this,  
22 that is always a possibility, but I am not aware of any  
23 where in the Review where this specific question that  
24 the Board asked me is dealt with.

25 I would just ask my friend, Mr. Freidin,

1 if, at a convenient time, he could advise me as to what  
2 the area of the Review that his witness is relying on  
3 in making that statement, and it doesn't have to be  
4 right away.

5 And, as I say, I will meanwhile seek  
6 instructions on the matter and, as I say, if I turn out  
7 to be wrong in respect to the Review I am going to be  
8 embarrassed, but it won't be the first time.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think, Mr.  
10 Freidin, and Mr. Campbell - and, of course, all of the  
11 other participants - that what we are dealing with now,  
12 and we might as well sort of deal with it at the outset  
13 of the hearing, is an issue that I think is going to be  
14 raised from time to time throughout these proceedings.

15 And, that is: as you have heard from  
16 some of the opening statements, some concern over  
17 whether or not the change from the designation forest  
18 management to timber management has any particular  
19 significance and, if so, whether that significance is a  
20 jurisdictional type of significance in terms of what  
21 exactly is this Board going to be considering in terms  
22 of this Class EA; and what issues are or are not before  
23 the Board; and what is the significance of this  
24 specific list of exemptions in terms of activities  
25 exempted; and how does that interface with that

1 paragraph 8 that we dealt with a few minutes ago as  
2 well?

3 MR. FREIDIN: Well, I can certainly agree  
4 that it is something that is going to have to be  
5 addressed.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that this is  
7 the appropriate witness to address it, or this is the  
8 appropriate time, but I really feel that in the  
9 interests of all of us understanding clearly what the  
10 matters are before us, we should try and somehow  
11 approach this issue at an early stage.

12 MR. FREIDIN: I understand your concern  
13 and I think it is something that I will have to -- that  
14 we will work on to make our position as clear as  
15 possible, as soon as possible.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: And I think, Mr. Campbell,  
17 the only reason I called on you at this point is  
18 because there are certain exemption orders involved  
19 that originated from the Minister of the Environment.

20 MR. CAMPBELL: He is who I represent, Mr.  
21 Chairman. I have no complaint about calling on him.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: And I think it would  
23 really be helpful to know what the interpretation of  
24 the Ministry of the Environment was in terms of the  
25 wording used in those exemption orders and the wording

1       used in paragraph 8.

2               And, again, we can deal with that at  
3       another time, and perhaps if we leave it at this moment  
4       and just go on -- because I think in fairness to all of  
5       you, you should have an opportunity to consult with  
6       your clients and consult the documentation as well.

7               MR. MARTEL: I was wondering if Mr.  
8       Douglas could tell us. He made reference to the  
9       document, the Review where the Ministry of the  
10      Environment apparently had agreed.

11              Maybe he could indicate the reference. I  
12      tried to find some reference to it.

13              MR. FREIDIN: I cannot remember his exact  
14      words. I am not sure whether he said it was dealt with  
15      expressly or whether that was his interpretation,  
16      but...

17              MR. MARTEL: I could be wrong.

18              MR. FREIDIN: I think it is something  
19      that I would rather sort of think about, or give a full  
20      answer --

21              THE CHAIRMAN: Rather than taking  
22      something out of context with respect to what your  
23      overall argument will be, I think in fairness, we  
24      should allow the Ministry of Natural Resources to  
25      formulate their position on this matter and present it



1 to the Board at one time.

2 MR. FREIDIN: I can tell you, I spent a  
3 few minutes during the break looking and I didn't find  
4 an express statement on the specific issue as it has  
5 arisen.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we  
7 leave it for now and move on with whatever else you  
8 want to deal with at the moment.

9 MR. FREIDIN: Yes.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: And then come back to the  
11 Board.

12 MR. FREIDIN: Yes. I understand that Mr.  
13 Edwards would like to address the Board on a short  
14 procedural matter before I continue.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

16 MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am  
17 concerned, as representing one of the part-time  
18 participants, of having an up-to-date list of the  
19 exhibits that are filed because I am not going to be  
20 here on a daily basis to note them down.

21 And the problem -- I understand, the  
22 reporter will be producing an exhibit list daily, I  
23 hope, but in terms of getting it available to counsel  
24 on a timely basis -- I know Mr. Colborne has a request  
25 before you about daily transcripts. I certainly am

1 concerned about a daily exhibit list because I would  
2 like to know what is going in.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have looked into  
4 the issue -- Mr. Freidin, excuse me, but we might as  
5 well deal with this at this time.

6 We have looked into the issue of whether  
7 or not we can produce the transcripts on a daily basis  
8 and, unfortunately, I do not think we can.

9 The arrangements we have got, Mr.  
10 Colborne, are that the evidence that was given Tuesday,  
11 I believe, will be available Friday morning, and so it  
12 is really Wednesday and Thursday for production and  
13 then the transcript would be available on Friday  
14 morning, at least here.

15 And we have indicated that there would be  
16 a five-day turnaround to the depositories throughout  
17 the province and it will take us probably another day  
18 to courier it overnight to some of these other  
19 locations.

20 But we find that we cannot arrange  
21 satisfactorily for production of transcripts for the  
22 following day.

23 What I think we will try to do, to assist  
24 you as well, is produce by the end of the day, and have  
25 it available at least early the next day, is a list of

1 the exhibits that were dealt with the previous day.

2 MR. EDWARDS: How would those be  
3 distributed, Mr. Chairman?

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, once again, you  
5 know, it becomes an administrative problem because we  
6 certainly would have them available here, and to get  
7 them to all the parties who will not be here in a  
8 timely fashion may be difficult to do because the  
9 parties are so wide spread across the province, and  
10 certainly mailing them out would not help very much, I  
11 would not think.

12 Although what we can do is perhaps -- a  
13 possibility that we will look into is putting it on the  
14 toll-free number on the recording in Toronto, so that  
15 anybody could call that toll-free number and perhaps at  
16 the end of the recording as to the update, there would  
17 be a brief litany of the exhibits that were dealt with  
18 the previous day by number and title.

19 MR. EDWARDS: Will the Board direct the  
20 secretary to have those available to those people who  
21 are here, or would we have to deal directly with the  
22 reporter?

23 MR. MANDER: No.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: No. I think the --

25 MR. MANDER: They will be available in

1 the reading room up-to-date as fast as we can update  
2 them.

3 MR. EDWARDS: All right. It is available  
4 in the reading room, but if I want to get a copy, will  
5 there be copies available for taking them out? I  
6 understand I am not allowed to remove material from the  
7 reading room.

8 MR. MANDER: We can make extra copies  
9 here if you want to pick them up.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, you could certainly  
11 pick them up. I mean, a list of the exhibits is a  
12 simple document. I mean, it can xeroxed off and  
13 available for people to take with them.

14 The type of documentation that you cannot  
15 take out of the reading room are the sets of  
16 transcripts and some of the larger exhibits and that  
17 kind of thing.

18 MR. EDWARDS: Is there going to be any  
19 photocopying facilities in the reading room?

20 MR. MANDER: No, the court reporter has a  
21 photocopier across from the reading room.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: There is a photocopying  
23 machine across the way from the reading room which the  
24 court reporter has set up, and I think we can make  
25 arrangements for that to be available to others.



1 Is that possible?

2 THE REPORTER: Yes, it is.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know on what  
4 basis, what the charges will be or that kind of thing  
5 yet, but we will certainly try and make arrangements  
6 that those kind of things can be photocopied.

7 MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Anything else of a  
9 procedural nature right at this moment?

10 (No response)

11 Very well. Mr. Freidin?

12 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, could you  
13 respond to the suggestion or perhaps to the proposition  
14 that the Ministry's approach in this environmental  
15 assessment is narrow or that other uses or users are  
16 not given equal consideration when compared to timber  
17 management activities?

18 MR. MONZON: A. Yes. I would respond,  
19 Mr. Chairman, with the observation and the intention  
20 that the approach is not at all narrow. We have  
21 attempted to define in the document those activities  
22 which we have been concerned with from the beginning  
23 relative to this undertaking.

24 And, in addressing those activities, it  
25 is our intention through the timber management planning

1 process to take on -- take a very wide scope as to how  
2 those activities impact on other uses and other users  
3 of the forest, and we will present evidence later which  
4 will demonstrate this, and that evidence will  
5 demonstrate the flexibility and the sensitivity that  
6 the Ministry will have relative to the impacts on those  
7 other uses and users.

8 Q. Thank you. Mr. Monzon, in a general  
9 sort of way, how has the Ministry approached the task  
10 of managing all of the resources that it has which sort  
11 of appear over a large geographical area the size of  
12 the province.

13 A. Generally, the Ministry has developed  
14 three approaches to deal with that wide variety of  
15 management challenges that we have.

16 The three approaches, briefly, are the  
17 development of an integrated resource management  
18 philosophy, a management system within the Ministry of  
19 Natural Resources, and an administrative organizational  
20 structure.

21 Q. And I understand that you are going  
22 to be speaking to some of those items, but not all?

23 A. Yes. I will be speaking to the  
24 integrated resource management philosophy, as well as  
25 the organizational structure; Mr. Douglas will be

1 speaking to the management system.

2 Q. Could you just give a very brief  
3 description of those three things, notwithstanding that  
4 Mr. Douglas is going to be referring to one of those in  
5 detail?

6 A. Very briefly, and not to take up time  
7 because we will be talking about it in more detail, the  
8 integrated resource management philosophy of the  
9 Ministry is one of co-ordinating programs and  
10 activities so as to optimize the benefits that can flow  
11 from those activities and, at the same time, minimize  
12 the conflicts.

13 The management system that we have in  
14 place within the Ministry is, in essence, the  
15 decision-making system within the organization and, as  
16 we have indicated, Mr. Douglas is going to describe  
17 this in some detail later on.

18 Basically, it deals with the aspect of  
19 direction relative to policy and program, the  
20 delegation of authority to the appropriate level within  
21 the organization to carry out that program direction,  
22 and the accountability of the various levels within the  
23 organization as to what has been achieved and how well  
24 it has been achieved.

25 It is a fairly complex exercise because

1 of the land and water responsibilities that the  
2 Ministry has, and it is further complicated by the land  
3 use planning component relative to those resource  
4 management responsibilities.

5 Q. And in relation to the administrative  
6 organization?

7 A. The administrative organization deals  
8 with the -- I guess, the key points I would make is  
9 that, first of all, the Ministry is a very  
10 decentralized organization and in that organization  
11 there are, in essence, three levels: There is a main  
12 office level, which is responsible primarily for policy  
13 formulation; there is a regional level, which is  
14 responsible for taking that policy and developing the  
15 programs; and then there is a district level, and I  
16 again will refer you to the map on the easel.

17 In terms of the 47 districts across the  
18 province, it is at that district level that the actual  
19 program delivery takes place. These are where the  
20 parks are operated, these are where the stocking  
21 activities take place, these are where the trees are  
22 planted, and so forth.

23 Q. Just so there is no confusion,  
24 throughout these proceedings I am sure we will hear the  
25 phrase 'minimized conflicts' a number of times. What



1 exactly do you mean when you use that phrase?

2 A. On any piece of land and water of  
3 Crown land in Ontario - and when I talk about a piece  
4 of land and water I am talking about large areas,  
5 several hundred hectares - there is going to be a  
6 competing interest for that land.

7 There will be timber interests, there  
8 will be moose hunters' interests, there will be fishing  
9 interests in the form of general recreation or in the  
10 form of tourism.

11 When I talk about minimizing the  
12 conflicts, I am talking about designing ways in which  
13 all of those activities can take place and not impact  
14 negatively one upon the other.

15 Q. Can there be conflicts in relation to  
16 a very small or very specific area?

17 A. Oh, absolutely.

18 Q. Such as...?

19 A. You can have an area where, for  
20 example, is proposed to be timber harvesting and also  
21 it is an area that is very highly desirable from a  
22 general recreation and general camping standpoint.

23 The challenge that the Ministry faces is  
24 to see what techniques can be put in place to allow  
25 both of those to take place without one negatively

1        impacting on the -- in the case of the camping, the  
2        social experience of the camping.

3                    Q.    Mr. Monzon, before you deal with the  
4        first topic, the first of those three items that you  
5        referred to, could you explain the basis upon which the  
6        decision was made to divide up the topics between you  
7        and Mr. Douglas?

8                    A.    That decision was made on the basis  
9        of the personal experience of Mr. Douglas and myself.

10                   As you pointed out in the opening  
11        remarks, my experience has been largely and primarily  
12        in the area of land use planning and the development of  
13        planning methodology and the application of that  
14        methodology to the Ministry of Natural Resources, and  
15        as part of that there is the linkage with the  
16        integrated resource management philosophy.

17                   Mr. Douglas has been certainly a major  
18        player in all of that. He has been more specifically  
19        involved in the resource management planning process  
20        and development thereof, as well as the management  
21        systems.

22                   Q.    Now, you have already indicated or  
23        given a brief description of integrated resource  
24        management. Could you perhaps expand on what the  
25        relevance of that philosophy is to this environmental

1 assessment?

2 A. I think the relevance of that  
3 philosophy and the details of that start to take shape  
4 on page 13 of the witness statement. I think the  
5 relevance of the philosophy is that that philosophy  
6 really becomes a way of doing business within the  
7 Ministry of Natural Resources.

8 In the carrying out of timber management  
9 activities on areas of land, certainly we have talked  
10 about - although not directly referenced the fact -  
11 that those activities do not take place in isolation  
12 from other activities in the forest.

13 I use the example of general camping  
14 activity on a particular area of land. There will also  
15 be situations where there may be a tourist activity.  
16 There will be, for example, a proposal for a park.

17 One of the -- if I might just continue on  
18 that one for a minute. One of the particular  
19 objectives of the Parks Program is the protection of  
20 unique and scientific areas of land and water within  
21 the province. Where you had that sort of situation and  
22 where you had one of those unique features developed,  
23 there would be that potential conflict.

24 So I think the point I would make is that  
25 the timber management activity, whether it is

1 harvesting or building a road or regeneration or what  
2 have you that it is being proposed for an area, does  
3 not take place in isolation from other activities that  
4 could be going on or could have an interest in that  
5 area.

6 And the integrated resource management  
7 philosophy is one that directs, as I indicated, the  
8 achieving of most benefits and minimizing the  
9 conflicts. And we see that as very complementary to  
10 the environment assessment which we are about now.

11 Q. Has the statement of integrated  
12 resource management been formalized in any way within  
13 the Ministry?

14 A. Yes, it was formalized, I believe, in  
15 1985 by the Deputy Minister.

16 Q. And I believe it is document No. 3  
17 which is found at page 39 of the witness statement.

18 You indicated that it was released by the  
19 Deputy Minister?

20 A. That's my recollection. I could be  
21 mistaken, but I believe that's correct.

22 Q. The date of release is indicated at  
23 the bottom of page 40 as -- and I always have trouble  
24 reading these dates which are set out this way. Is  
25 that February the 7th, 1985?



1 A. That would be my interpretation.

2 Q. All right. To whom was it released  
3 on that date?

4 A. It was released to all of the staff  
5 within the Ministry of Natural Resources.

6 Q. For what purpose?

7 A. The purpose was to indicate to the  
8 staff the direction that the Ministry wanted to go in  
9 dealing with stakeholders and the direction that the  
10 Ministry wanted to go in the management of the natural  
11 resources of the province.

12 I think it is probably fair to say that  
13 while there has been an attempt over the years to work  
14 towards this, it has been more successful in some areas  
15 of the province and some levels of the organization  
16 than in others, and certainly one of the intents here  
17 in releasing a formal statement was to make it clear to  
18 all staff, at all levels in the organization, and at  
19 all geographic parts of the organization, the direction  
20 that the Ministry was moving, its philosophy, and the  
21 way that it was going to be doing business.

22 Q. Are there any particular parts of  
23 that document, Mr. Monzon, that you believe -- or that  
24 you wish to refer to specifically?

25 A. I think it is worthwhile to spend

1 some time on the principles which are shown on page 39  
2 and the expectations from the staff that are shown on  
3 page 40.

4 If I can continue, the --

5 Q. If I can just -- I'm sorry.

6 A. I am sorry.

7 Q. Before you do go on, you have  
8 mentioned a couple of times in your evidence and just a  
9 moment ago, you use the phrase stakeholders. Perhaps  
10 before we go on you can indicate to the Board what do  
11 you mean by that term?

12 A. When I refer to stakeholders I am  
13 referring to people, general public, interest groups,  
14 organizations, companies that have an interest in the  
15 way that we do business in the forest; people and  
16 groups that are concerned about not only timber  
17 resources, but also fisheries resources and parks  
18 resources and so forth.

19 Q. All right. I am sorry I interrupted  
20 you. Perhaps you can then indicate those parts of the  
21 document that you wish to highlight?

22 A. Perhaps just starting with the  
23 definition, I believe we covered it and I referred to  
24 it generally on a number of occasions, but I think it  
25 is important for the purposes of this hearing to read

1 it into the record it being:

2 "Integrated resource management being the  
3 co-ordination of resource management  
4 programs and activities so the long-term  
5 benefits are optimized and conflicts  
6 between programs are minimized."

7 As we indicate, it is the main corporate  
8 philosophy to be utilized by the staff of the Ministry  
9 in the achievement of goals and objectives, and I think  
10 the last line is very key:

11 "...that the philosophy and the way of  
12 doing business is not an end in itself  
13 but it is a means of achieving results."

14 The principles --

15 Q. Before you go on to the principles,  
16 can you just go back to the first paragraph, the second  
17 last line says:

18 "Benefits are defined by corporately  
19 approved program targets...", et cetera.

20 What is meant by corporately approved?

21 A. Corporately approved means approved  
22 by the Ministry of Natural Resources at the senior  
23 level, that would be the Deputy Minister and the senior  
24 executive team in the Ministry.

25 Q. All right.

1                   A. In terms of principles, there are  
2 some six of those - and I won't read these all, Mr.  
3 Chairman, but I will try and highlight them.

4                   Number one being that all components of  
5 the management system must use the approach and the  
6 approach must continually be assessed to improve -- to  
7 look at how well it is doing and the linkages between  
8 the various components of the management systems.

9                   I know this sounds a little fuzzy at this  
10 point, Mr. Douglas is going to clarify all that a  
11 little later, but those linkages must be assessed to  
12 ensure and show how well the philosophy is being  
13 practised.

14                  We are also saying in number two that the  
15 onus is on the staff, the individual staff, to  
16 contribute to the achievement of all Ministry programs  
17 wherever this is possible.

18                  By this we mean that because an  
19 individual happens to be a forester or a biologist or a  
20 land use planner, that individual in carrying out his  
21 or her work should not necessarily be only concerned  
22 with the achievement of objectives that relate to his  
23 or her discipline; they have to be concerned with the  
24 achievement of all of the objectives of the Ministry.

25                  We are saying that, in most cases,



1 multiple use of the resources will be our desired  
2 direction because that, in our experience, has been the  
3 best approach to optimizing benefits and minimizing  
4 conflicts.

5 But there are going to be some specific  
6 situations where, on particular pieces of land and  
7 water, that approach is not going to work and there is  
8 going to have to be a single-use approach for a number  
9 of uses that are taken in sequence.

10 An example of that would be aggregate,  
11 where aggregate is extracted from a pit, the aggregate  
12 resource is utilized, the pit remains and then what  
13 does one do with the pit in order to utilize the land  
14 area.

15 We are saying that the natural and human  
16 resources should be blended together to yield the  
17 optimum combination of benefits. What we are talking  
18 about there is in terms of carrying out activities of  
19 the Ministry in the field or at the district level,  
20 that we are talking about the best use of money and  
21 people power available.

22 In some cases, it may not be sufficient  
23 simply to utilize the existing budget that has been  
24 specifically allocated to an activity and there may be  
25 some borrowing and sharing that will take place both in

1 terms of funds and in terms of staff.

2 Q. Just while you are on that particular  
3 matter, how does the Ministry get funded for the  
4 activities or programs that it has?

5 A. The Ministry is funded yearly by the  
6 government through the estimates group of the  
7 legislature.

8 Q. I note in Principle No. 4 there is  
9 reference to program targets. I understand that that  
10 will be dealt with by both you and Mr. Douglas in your  
11 evidence?

12 A. That's right.

13 Q. All right.

14 A. Principle 5 says that we want to  
15 maintain open and effective communications both within  
16 our Ministry, outside agencies, interest groups and the  
17 public. This is, in essence, the issue of public  
18 consultation, and while we have been in that business  
19 and in that mode for a long period of time, it is our  
20 expectation that we have to improve, that we have to  
21 get better at it.

22 From our standpoint, good communications,  
23 both internally and externally, are just so key to  
24 decision making that it almost goes without saying. We  
25 have to be abreast of the outside interests, we have to

1 be abreast of the viewpoints.

2 The complexity of resource management  
3 issues that the Ministry faces today has significantly  
4 increased from what it was 10, 20 and 30 years ago, and  
5 the communication and understanding of the issues, of  
6 the methodologies available to meet those issues are  
7 widespread, both within the Ministry and without, and  
8 it is important that in achieving the benefits of those  
9 various programs that we draw on all of the expertise  
10 that there is.

11 Q. You referred to resource management  
12 becoming more complex...

13 A. More complex in terms of the issues  
14 and more complex in terms of the demands that have been  
15 placed on the land base and the resources thereon.

16 Q. Is there any explanation for that, or  
17 do you have any views on what's caused that change?

18 A. I think in terms of today's situation  
19 we are seeing a much more educated public and we are  
20 seeing a very much increased concern over the proper  
21 use of resources.

22 At the same time, we are seeing  
23 resources, the basic natural resources being used in a  
24 much greater variety of ways than you saw 20 and 25  
25 years ago.

1                   The timber industry is a good example.  
2       And while I am not an expert in this - and I will not  
3       go on at great length - it is fair to say, I believe,  
4       that in the utilization of wood fibre there is a  
5       tremendously increased number of products and product  
6       mix that is available today now than there was a number  
7       of years ago.

8                   If you translate -- or if you extend that  
9       across other resources, in terms of fisheries, wildlife  
10      and what have you, there is a much greater expectation  
11      on the benefits to be received.

12                  We have a larger public that wants to  
13      utilize those resources and, as I indicated earlier,  
14      they are much more interested now and have significant  
15      expertise to offer in the way in which those resources  
16      are managed.

17                  Q.   You mentioned in the reference to the  
18      forest industry that there was an increased product  
19      mix; what do you mean by product mix?

20                  A.   I would suggest that 25 years ago we  
21      looked at pulp and paper and veneer and now we are into  
22      things like chipboard and pressboard, utilizing  
23      different techniques of manufacturing and there is just  
24      so much more variety of products that are on the market  
25      and available today than there was 20, 25 years ago.



1 Q. Okay. Perhaps you can just continue  
2 on with --

3 A. The final principle is that the  
4 Ministry must have regard for individual and combined  
5 consequences of its plans and programs, both in the  
6 short term, long term, positively or negatively.

7 The issue here is that we have to continue  
8 to think through, to think through very carefully, the  
9 impacts of the decision making that are made relative  
10 to a policy or to a plan or to a program and how that's  
11 going to affect the land and water base down the line  
12 and how it is going to affect the other resource users  
13 or uses that are going to be taking place on that same  
14 land base.

15 Q. I note that in Principle No. 2 there  
16 is reference to interdisciplinary teams. Can you  
17 explain what that particular reference means and its  
18 importance in terms of the Ministry's activities?

19 A. In carrying out management activities  
20 now, there is no longer the situation where individual  
21 resource disciplines plan and carry out activities in  
22 isolation.

23 In the preparation of timber management  
24 plans, as an example - which we will get into in more  
25 detail later on - the unit forester does not sit in

1 isolation and prepare a plan. The unit forester sits  
2 with a biologist or a biologist may sit with -- he or  
3 she may sit with a moose biologist and a fisheries  
4 biologist and they may sit with a planner, and then  
5 they may sit with people skilled in lands and  
6 aggregate, and they will take a holistic look at the  
7 area in which the plan is to be prepared so that all of  
8 the resource impacts and potential conflicts can be  
9 identified.

10 The planning of timber is the planning of  
11 any of the resources that the Ministry is now engaged  
12 in. It is generally carried out through those  
13 multi-disciplinary teams and that occurs at all levels  
14 in the organization from main office through the  
15 region, down through the district.

16 So it is not something that happens in  
17 isolation; there are a wide variety of disciplines that  
18 are involved.

19 MRS. KOVEN: How many people are employed  
20 by the Ministry, roughly?

21 MR. MONZON: In the order -- on the  
22 classified staff there is 36-, 3700 as I recall. I  
23 stand to be corrected on specific counts, but it is  
24 close.

25 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Is the number in terms

1 of the unclassified service large or small?

2 A. The unclassified staff in the  
3 Ministry, the number varies depending on the time of  
4 year.

5 There is a significant increase generally  
6 in the summer months and there will be a large increase  
7 in the northwest right now, given the fire that has  
8 been going on and so that number varies.

9 It could rise -- the total staff in the  
10 Ministry could rise to 9-, 10,000 over the course of a  
11 year and then it will fall off again as one moves.

12 Q. And just quickly so there is no  
13 confusion, can you explain the difference between  
14 classified and unclassified staff?

15 A. Classified staff are staff that are  
16 employed by the Ministry on a full-time basis in a  
17 specific job. Unclassified staff are staff that are  
18 hired for short periods of time for very specific  
19 projects which have a beginning and an end.

20 Q. I notice as well, Mr. Monzon, in the  
21 last item, Item No. 4 on page 40, there is reference to  
22 MNR managers playing a pivotal role in helping their  
23 staff to achieve positive attitudes, et cetera.

24 Who is referred to when the phrase "MNR  
25 managers" is used in this context?

1           A. Well, here we are talking about  
2 managers at all levels in the organization and staff in  
3 the organization who supervise other staff in terms of  
4 transmitting the philosophy and the requirement to  
5 undertake integrated resource management in a program  
6 or cross-programs at all levels within the  
7 organization.

8           We see the managers as being very key in  
9 transmitting that philosophy and that awareness to all  
10 of the staff that are going to be working in those  
11 programs.

12           I think, as I indicated earlier, the staff  
13 within the Ministry are really the key to the  
14 implementation of this -- to this philosophy, that the  
15 philosophy is a way of doing business and not an end  
16 onto itself and if the attitude and the commitment to  
17 IRM, as indicated in the first point under staff  
18 expectations, are not there, then the integrated  
19 resource management philosophy is not going to be  
20 carried out as well as it should be.

21           We also, in terms of the expectations of  
22 staff, indicate that they have to be aware and continue  
23 to develop knowledge and awareness on how integrated  
24 resource management can be achieved.

25           It is not enough anymore to be only



1       concerned, as I have indicated, about a specific  
2       program. Staff have to be concerned about other  
3       programs and they have to continue to take the time and  
4       the effort to learn about those programs, to learn  
5       about how their particular discipline and activity  
6       could impact on those other programs, and what the  
7       mitigating effects or strategies are that they can put  
8       in place - the things that they can do in carrying out  
9       their program - that would be reduce or erase any  
10      conflict that could exist with those other areas, with  
11      those other plans.

12               I think, obviously, the most obvious item  
13      is the day-to-day activities of the staff and we are  
14      saying that the staff have to apply philosophy  
15      continually, and if they don't do that integrated  
16      resource management is going to fail.

17               Certainly, there is a recognition within  
18      the organization that we cannot simply issue a  
19      directive and tell -- it says that staff must be aware  
20      of integrated management and should practise it.

21               There is training, there are sessions  
22      that have to be held to make people aware, to sort out  
23      what the problems are, to sort out what the roadblocks  
24      are for various levels within the organization and  
25      among the disciplines in order to achieve this.

1                   And those are the sorts of things that  
2                   have been going on and will have to continue to go on  
3                   at all levels in the organization.

4                   I guess in summary, Mr. Chairman, there  
5                   is a number of keys that we see to the success of this  
6                   philosophy: The staff, the attitude and commitment,  
7                   the improved program awareness, training, job  
8                   cross-overs - moving people from timber program to a  
9                   lands program to a parks program - giving them the  
10                  experience, getting them to know how things work and  
11                  some of the consequences.

12                  And, as you indicated at the start of  
13                  this section, the managers are going to be the key  
14                  because that's where the emphasis is going to come  
15                  from, that's where the push is, they are going to be  
16                  the ones that are going to make it happen.

17                  MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, some of the  
18                  training of the type that Mr. Monzon referred to will  
19                  be addressed by Panel No. 8.

20                  THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

21                  MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, in the  
22                  evidence of a number of witnesses, I am sure we are  
23                  going to hear people saying: Something is occurring in  
24                  the field or out in the field.

25                  Let's get it straight right from the

1 beginning, what does that mean?

2 MR. MONZON: A. The field is the  
3 reference to the regional and district levels within  
4 the organization where the folks go out from the  
5 offices and go into the forest, go on the water, and  
6 lay out the surveys for the cottage lots, lay out the  
7 operational cruises for timber, do the pellet counts  
8 for deer surveys, that sort of thing.

9 Q. I know you have described integrated  
10 resource management in a general way, but could you  
11 advise, how does integrated resource management  
12 manifest itself in the field?

13 A. It manifests itself in the field  
14 really through three, what we call, management themes.  
15 And, again, I would refer the Board to page 41 and 42  
16 of the witness statement.

17 These themes are resource sharing,  
18 partnership and public consultation, and really are the  
19 descriptions of how we do business out there within  
20 this integrated resource management philosophy.

21 Q. Before you deal with the contents of  
22 that document, this document has caused some confusion  
23 when the witness statement went out as to whether it  
24 was part of the formal statement, which is document No.  
25 3. Could you perhaps clarify any confusion that may

1 still be remaining about that matter?

2 A. This document was prepared  
3 specifically for this environmental assessment, for  
4 this hearing, in order to focus more clearly on the  
5 business that we are doing under the integrated  
6 resource management philosophy.

7 Q. Could you expand then or describe the  
8 three principles and pick an example that you think  
9 will be helpful in explaining your evidence?

10 A. Well, let me go through the themes.  
11 And you will see from the structure of the document,  
12 page 41 and 42 we describe the theme and then there are  
13 a number of examples given.

14 In terms of resource sharing, we are  
15 simply saying that we recognize that there is many and  
16 sometimes competing uses out there, and we also  
17 recognize that we are going to have to accommodate as  
18 many of those needs as possible to achieve the overall  
19 benefits. That will start to become consistent with  
20 the integrated resource management philosophy.

21 We also indicate that we expect that  
22 those users who are placing demands on the various  
23 natural resources out there recognize that others have  
24 an interest, other uses, other users have an interest  
25 in that land and water base too and they are going to



1 have to take that into account so that a tourist  
2 operator or a timber company is not going to have -- is  
3 not going to be able to look in isolation at this  
4 situation, he is also going to have to be aware of that  
5 larger picture and be aware of impacts.

6 For the Ministry, administratively, it  
7 means that the variety of resources; technical,  
8 financial, human, will have to be shared --

9 Did I say something wrong, Mr. Chairman?

10 MR. FREIDIN: I was once in court and the  
11 lights went out and I was wondering whether that was...  
12 ---Discussion off the record

13 THE CHAIRMAN: I will tell you what, it  
14 is 12:30...

15 MR. MONZON: So I will talk real fast.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we break for  
17 lunch and we will work on the sound system over the  
18 lunch hour.

19 MR. FREIDIN: Very well.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: We will return at 2:00  
21 p.m. We didn't do that on purpose.

22 ---Luncheon recess at 12:30 p.m.

23 ---Upon resuming at 2:00 p.m.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Be seated,  
25 please.

1                   Very well, Mr. Freidin.

2                   MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, perhaps we  
3 could pick up. We were referring to page 41 of the  
4 witness statement. I think you had described the theme  
5 of resource sharing and you have listed some examples,  
6 and I see that one of the examples is a matter that you  
7 have already referred to in your evidence; is that  
8 correct?

9                   MR. MONZON: A. That's correct. I think  
10 my sense would be that unless the Board would require  
11 further clarification I would move on.

12                  Q. All right. The example that you  
13 referred to is the second one here, tourism operators  
14 are allocated a certain percentage of moose tags.

15                  A. Yes.

16                  Q. In terms of partnerships in resource  
17 management. Again, Mr. Monzon, I don't want you to  
18 leave out anything that you feel is important - but,  
19 you know, as we discussed, we are going to try to avoid  
20 repetition as much as possible - but I just caution  
21 you, don't leave out something that you think is  
22 important.

23                  So take a look at partnerships in  
24 resource management and would you like to describe that  
25 and provide an example to the Board.

1           A. Thank you. In terms of the issue of  
2       partnerships in resource management, the second theme,  
3       certainly one of the key aspects of that is looking to  
4       increase the benefits derived from obtaining greater  
5       input from a variety of groups and individuals involved  
6       in resources management.

7           When I talk about receiving input, we are  
8       talking about both in the form of data and basic  
9       information and also input relative to the alternatives  
10      that might be available for resolution of issues, and I  
11      think that's something that we are very interested in  
12      and intend to spend more time doing.

13          Certainly, the recognition that other  
14      people have a stake in the management of the natural  
15      resources, I think we talked about that earlier. And  
16      really the third bullet is a follow-up from that, where  
17      individuals and groups have the interest and put their  
18      energies forward. There is a tremendous body of  
19      knowledge that is built up out there that we want to  
20      take advantage of.

21          And the final point I would make here is  
22      that partnerships can involve any number of ventures  
23      involving other ministries, levels of government, the  
24      private sector, companies, individuals; and certainly  
25      in the Forest Management Agreement Program, you have an

1       excellent example of a partnership at the forestry  
2       level. You have the community fisheries involved in  
3       the program, community wildlife involved with the  
4       program, examples of partnerships in the outdoor  
5       recreation area. Then I think I have covered the  
6       examples.

7                   The final point I would make here in  
8       terms of the themes is one of public consultation, and  
9       I believe that I have talked a fair bit about that this  
10      morning.

11                   I think the point I would make is that  
12      the Ministry does recognize even more than in the past  
13      the need to have input before making decisions. The  
14      basic reason for that is for better resource decision  
15      making, better decision making around the management of  
16      resources; it will maximize the benefits, minimize the  
17      conflicts, and improves the accountability all the way  
18      around.

19                   The examples that I would refer to in  
20      this one is the District Land Use Guideline exercise,  
21      and we will be talking about that in a little bit more  
22      detail later on, but certainly there were number of  
23      ways in which public consultation was carried out.

24                   The example that is given here is open  
25      houses, public forums, direct mailing in terms of



1 letters and so forth.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin, is that  
3 particular topic going to be dealt with specifically by  
4 other witnesses in another panel, or is this witness  
5 going to deal with public consultation?

6 MR. FREIDIN: Well, this witness is going  
7 to be dealing with the land use planning exercise and  
8 the public consultation involved with that particular  
9 exercise.

10 Other witnesses will be talking about the  
11 public consultation opportunities, for instance, in  
12 relation to the preparation and the contents of timber  
13 management plans themselves. That evidence won't occur  
14 until we get down to Panel 15 which will deal with  
15 timber management plans themselves.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: So that is something that  
17 where it occurs, each of the panels will more or less  
18 be dealing with it, if it involves their subject  
19 matter; is that correct?

20 MR. FREIDIN: Yes, I think so, because in  
21 some cases, as the witness has indicated, the form in  
22 which the public consultation takes places varies from  
23 situation to situation.

24 MR. MARTEL: May I ask what takes place  
25 in an open house, the consultation that arises out of

1 an open house?

2 MR. MONZON: An open house is an  
3 opportunity to share information and alternatives  
4 between the Ministry and whatever stakeholders or  
5 client groups wish to attend. It is a public session.

6 For example, in a timber management plan,  
7 at the beginning all of the basic information would be  
8 on display; the area in which the timber management  
9 plan is proposed, there would probably be maps  
10 indicating the type of wood that was available in the  
11 area, access plans would be available, there would be  
12 information on moose, deer if they were in the area,  
13 there would be information on fisheries.

14 So it is an opportunity for people to  
15 come to see what is available, make some input in terms  
16 of the appropriateness of that information; whether it  
17 is accurate, whether it is inaccurate, whether  
18 information has been missed, then it can move on from  
19 there in terms of the location of a particular road,  
20 should it go this way, should it go that way, what are  
21 the conflicts, how are people are impacted, and it is  
22 an opportunity for give and take and discussion between  
23 staff and stakeholders, general public.

24 MR. MARTEL: At that level, is it more of  
25 a one-way street of the Ministry providing information

1 or is there a real dialogue that goes on, I guess, is  
2 what I am trying find out?

3 MR. MONZON: I think certainly the thrust  
4 of the consultation that we are trying to develop and  
5 are developing with respect to timber management is  
6 more of a two-way dialogue.

7 Certainly, I think it would be fair to  
8 say that in the past the perception has been that it is  
9 one way, and that is something that we have to change  
10 very much because there is, as I indicated earlier, a  
11 wider body of knowledge and expertise out there that we  
12 have to take advantage of.

13 MR. FREIDIN: Q. And I understand that  
14 you will be able to speak from personal knowledge as to  
15 the various stages involved in the land use planning  
16 exercises that you will be referring to; is that  
17 correct?

18 MR. MONZON: A. That's correct.

19 MR. FREIDIN: And again, just to note,  
20 Mr. Martel, the four opportunities for public input or  
21 review through open houses and timber management plans  
22 will be dealt with by a separate panel and that process  
23 will be explained in detail.

24 Q. Now, Mr. Monzon, the philosophy of  
25 integrated resource management is dated February the

1 7th, 1985, and in the witness statement starting at  
2 paragraph 21, you indicate that this particular  
3 philosophy, the development of it has taken place or  
4 the formalization of it has taken place over a fairly  
5 lengthy period of time?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. I am just wondering if you could go  
8 back, and starting from when you believe the first step  
9 in that history occurred, take us up to and including  
10 the land use planning exercise?

11 A. All right. Let me take you back to  
12 the point that I became involved in planning and that  
13 goes back to 1969.

14 At that point in time, the land use  
15 planning in the then Department of Lands & Forests  
16 existed only to the point in northern Ontario and, Mr.  
17 Chairman, I'll confine my remarks to that part of the  
18 province.

19 Q. When you refer to northern Ontario  
20 are you referring to the --

21 A. The four northern regions.

22 Q. Thank you.

23 A. There was a zoning system in place  
24 under the Public Lands Act which dealt with  
25 recreational activity and, in fact, the zoning system,



1 as it was described, really dealt with whether or not  
2 recreational structures could be permanent as opposed  
3 to being temporary.

4 At that period of time, plans that were  
5 being developed or were developed by the Department of  
6 Lands & Forests were largely single use. The timber  
7 management plan, the forest management plan that was  
8 developed in those days was largely single purpose  
9 relative to forestry, forestry activities, the  
10 activities that took place such as hunting, such as  
11 fishing, such as camping were recognized, but I think  
12 it is fair to say only superficially; they were not  
13 given any - I was going to say formal status and that  
14 is not quite correct - they weren't -- the impact of  
15 timber management, forest management on those type of  
16 activities was not considered in nearly the depth that  
17 it is today.

18 As I say, the planning that was done was  
19 largely single purpose, and certainly the example in  
20 the 1960s of Algonquin Park showed the people in Lands  
21 & Forests that more integration was needed, more  
22 understanding of how activities impacted one on the  
23 other and how conflicts needed to be sorted out, and  
24 also showed that people wanted real involvement in the  
25 planning process, because at that point it was a plan

1 that was done, to a large degree, in isolation and then  
2 there was a lot of fault found with that plan by the  
3 review of the general public. So the integration  
4 motion was developing.

5 That notion developed to the 1970s where  
6 the Lands & Forests were starting to do what they call  
7 local area land use plans. One was done in the area of  
8 Sudbury in an area called Degrassi, another one was  
9 done in the Thunder Bay area in Northern Light Lake.

10 Largely those were land use planning  
11 exercises taking place in specific areas where there  
12 were conflicts, and conflicts which were so great that  
13 there was no apparent resolution, at least not one that  
14 could be worked out at the local level.

15 And, in those situations, the conflicts  
16 were involving recreational activity versus harvesting  
17 activity, whether it be timber or trapping or whatever,  
18 but certainly timber was the focus.

19 By the early 1970s, because of the  
20 conflicts that were developing and because of the  
21 notion and more involvement, it was recognized that  
22 there was going to be a real change needed, and I guess  
23 the summary of the reasons as to why that change was  
24 needed is shown on page 14, paragraph 21 of the witness  
25 statement: The increasing demands and pressure on the

1 resource base, the increasing awareness of accumulative  
2 economic and environmental impacts of various resource  
3 management practices.

4 When we talk about environmental impacts,  
5 we are talking about things like timber activity  
6 versus -- and the impact that activity might have on a  
7 fly-in fishing activity in and around a particular  
8 lake. So you are looking at the social and the  
9 economic impact of those activities; increasing  
10 complexity of program issues, and turning towards  
11 increasing level of specialization.

12 At this point in time, we were having  
13 more people who were doing different things and doing  
14 more specialized things.

15 Lets say, in 1960 you had a biologist in  
16 the district. In 1970 you may have had a moose  
17 biologist and a fisheries biologist, and that has  
18 progressed to the point where you have a warm water  
19 fisheries and a cold water fisheries biologist, and so  
20 you have more specialization. There is more knowledge  
21 and more varying points of view; examples of what I am  
22 trying to portray around the word complexity.

23 I have talked about the increasing desire  
24 of the public, the stakeholders to become involved;  
25 also talked a little bit about the increasing awareness



1 and the limitations of the confusion associated with  
2 the multiple-resource concept.

3 Multiple use is a concept which works and  
4 is very applicable to large areas of land where you can  
5 have a timber activity that is going on in concert with  
6 a recreational activity. In very small areas of land  
7 that doesn't work very well, and uses have to be more  
8 single purpose or follow one from the other.

9 And, finally, the demands for an  
10 increased level of economic efficiency and  
11 accountability in government. Decisions were being  
12 made relative to the land base based on the urgency at  
13 the moment and without a clear tie back to larger  
14 policy issues.

15 For example, if you had a situation where  
16 you had to look at a planning exercise that involves a  
17 sports fishery and a commercial fishery, you may very  
18 well, within the scope of that planning exercise, come  
19 to a resolution of what was more important, but one  
20 could do that outside of the larger context as to  
21 whether or not a commercial fishery should in fact  
22 continue on that particular body of water.

23 Perhaps, if I might, if I could go to the  
24 board I could give you an example of the type of land  
25 use planning exercise that we were involved with at



1       that point in time and the example might give you a  
2       display of why it wasn't working.

3                   If we consider the blocked-out area to be  
4       the piece of land or water on which we have a  
5       particular problem, let's try and focus the problem in  
6       this corner of the block. (indicating)

7                   Q.   That's the top right-hand corner?

8                   A.   I am sorry, at the top right-hand  
9       corner of the block. In this area, let's make the  
10      assumption - and I will try and keep the example  
11      simple - that we have a conflict between timber  
12      harvesting and, let's say, wilderness recreation.

13                   It may be particularly good canoeing and  
14      particularly scenic, but one can go through within the  
15      context of this area and look at the benefits to be  
16      derived from timber harvesting in this area; one can  
17      look at the jobs, one can look at the economic impact,  
18      one can look at the impact on local communities and all  
19      of that. One can also look at wilderness recreation  
20      and make the same sort of judgment; you can look at the  
21      impact, you can look at the number of recreational  
22      opportunities, you can make some judgment about the  
23      value of the wilderness recreation. And on the basis  
24      of that assessment, that analysis within this area, one  
25      can make a determination as to which is more important.

1                   And so let's assume that you make the  
2                   decision that wilderness recreation is going to be more  
3                   important. That means that in terms of timber  
4                   harvesting, perhaps that it can't take place in this  
5                   area. So a number of options are possible: You can  
6                   move the timber harvesting over here. (indicating)

7                   Q. That is indicating you are moving out  
8                   of that area?

9                   A. Moving out of the area and to the  
10                  west, or you can move the timber harvesting to the  
11                  south of the area or, as one would want to do in those  
12                  days, one could move it this way. (indicating)

13                  If you move it into this area  
14                  (indicating) you had to look at the impact on --

15                  Q. Mr. Monzon?

16                  A. If you moved it to the east, you had  
17                  to look at the impact on other activities that might be  
18                  taking place in this piece of land, same situation to  
19                  the south. If you moved it to the west, sometimes that  
20                  assessment did not happen.

21                  Now the result of that --

22                  Q. Mr. Monzon, I think you have got east  
23                  and west mixed up; don't you.

24                  A. Do I? Right. I am a forester not a  
25                  geographer.

1                   Where this particularly starts to get  
2           difficult is when you do these things in isolation and  
3           when you don't consider what is going on around you?

4                   And the situation that we started to find  
5           ourselves was that you started to develop similar  
6           situations adjacent because you were putting a  
7           pressure -- we were putting a pressure on a resource  
8           from an area into another without considering it.

9                   And we started to find ourselves in the  
10          situation of, while it was nice to move this way, there  
11          wasn't any opportunity to move this way because, for  
12          example, if it was timber harvesting, all of that area  
13          was committed to Kimberly-Clark and they weren't too  
14          happy seeing a representative from Boise being  
15          tentatively assigned the limit.

16                   It became even more paramount if we had -  
17          and I am drawing a line between the two areas - a  
18          district or a regional boundary in there, because I  
19          think it is fair to say that in those days the lines of  
20          communication between the two administrative units were  
21          not the best, so we were having some problems.

22                   THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Monzon, would you mind  
23          marking that drawing as an exhibit?

24                   MR. MONZON: Certainly.

25                   THE CHAIRMAN: Exhibit 12.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: And what can we call it,  
2 for the purposes of the record?

3 MR. FREIDIN: Q. What do you want to  
4 call it, Mr. Monzon?

5 MR. MONZON: A. Local land use planning  
6 example.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.  
8 ---EXHIBIT NO. 12: Local land use planning example.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: You realize at the end all  
10 these sketches made by the various witnesses, if they  
11 are signed, we are going to auction them off.

12 MR. FREIDIN: Well, I was just going to  
13 ask whether he was going to sign it.

14 MR. MONZON: I will be back tonight with  
15 my lectroset to clean it up.

16 So this is what was going on and we had  
17 some problems. It was forcing some ad hoc decisions.  
18 We weren't considering things like line capability, we  
19 had problems with user displacement, we had lack of an  
20 overall policy as to whether the timber harvesting that  
21 was being displaced to another area should or should  
22 not in fact go on.

23 We were also finding the resources were  
24 finite - this was not an over-the-hill exercises - that  
25 there was always more; there was always more trees,



1       there was always more fish, there was always more  
2       moose.

3                       As a result, in 1972 the Ministry was  
4       established, the Department of Lands & Forests merged  
5       together with the Ministry of Mines, and one of the  
6       first decisions made was to review the existing  
7       planning system - and I am almost quoting here from  
8       paragraph 25 on page 15:

9                       "...and establish a program to provide a  
10       longer term direction and co-ordinate the  
11       various land uses of the Ministry so that  
12       optimum benefits would be derived from  
13       the natural resources administered by the  
14       Ministry."

15                      The principle of that exercise - there  
16       were three of them: That any planning -- land use  
17       planning that was going to take place should be  
18       preceded by a clear statement of objectives; planning  
19       was to take place and not proceed in a hierarchial  
20       form - from provincial down to more specific regional  
21       and local levels - and public participation was be an  
22       integral component of the exercise.

23                      At the same time, when those two  
24       organizations merged, that provided a real opportunity  
25       for integration, given that the mandate of all of the

1 natural resources was now under the responsibility of  
2 one Ministry.

3 And in addition to devising and setting  
4 in place of a new planning system, the Ministry  
5 organized itself so as to integrate policy decision  
6 making at the main office level, integrate program  
7 development at the regional level, and integrate the  
8 delivery at the district level.

9 And I make that point, Mr. Chairman -- or  
10 those three points, because I think that is a further  
11 example of the development of the integrated resource  
12 management philosophy.

13 In 1972 there was a real opportunity to  
14 start to build on that and put concrete systems in  
15 place within the organization to make this happen.

16 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, could you  
17 just -- you have touched on the three major principles,  
18 perhaps you could -- I assume there were others and  
19 that is why you called them major principles.

20 Perhaps you could indicate why they are  
21 important; why they were identified as major  
22 principles?

23 A. Well, they are major principles  
24 because it would be the first time that -- one of the  
25 first times that we had in our planning process

1 indicated the need for a clear statement of an  
2 objective and a quantified objective at the start of  
3 the exercise, something that we found to be extremely  
4 important.

5 In terms of the hierarchy, what we wanted  
6 to avoid was situations as shown in Exhibit 12, and in  
7 order to start to make the tradeoffs of the resources  
8 as one would have to do in managing resources, we felt  
9 it was necessary to start with an indication of what we  
10 wanted to achieve at the broad level and then move down  
11 so that there was a logical progression as one moved  
12 through the system.

13 Q. When you refer to indicating what you  
14 wanted to achieve, is that what is meant by clear  
15 statement of objectives in Item A?

16 A. Clear statement of objectives and the  
17 benefits resulting from those objectives; yes, sir.

18 And, finally, public participation being  
19 an integral component, certainly a tremendously key  
20 factor as far as we were concerned. We had utilized it  
21 before, not to the degree that we felt was necessary,  
22 and I submit, I think, that not to the degree that we  
23 think is still necessary now.

24 Q. So I understand then, as a result of  
25 those concerns and those thoughts, the Ministry then

1 entered into this land use planning exercise which  
2 you -- the description of which starts on page 16?

3 A. That's correct, and the first stage  
4 of that was -- this integrated program was the  
5 designation of the three planning regions. I think, if  
6 you will recall from the map this morning, we have  
7 indicated in the green outline what those were:  
8 northwest, northeast and in southern Ontario.

9 Q. All right. And you are referring to  
10 Exhibit 11?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. How were the boundaries for those  
13 particular regions, the three planning regions, chosen?

14 A. They were chosen to coincide with the  
15 old Treasury & Economics planning regions that were put  
16 forward in 197 -- about 1972, I believe, when that  
17 design for development was an initiative of the  
18 government.

19 At that point, we felt it would be better  
20 to be part of that exercise than to try and set up a  
21 separate administrative boundary around it. So those  
22 regions are the same as the old T & E planning regions.

23 I am sorry, with the exception of  
24 southern Ontario, southern Ontario there were three  
25 Treasury & economic regions. For our purposes we



1 rolled those together into one.

2 Q. Now, in terms of the area of the  
3 undertaking, a portion of that undertaking or the area  
4 of the undertaking falls outside the two northern  
5 planning regions; is that correct?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And that would be the area then which  
8 is south of the -- perhaps you could indicate it on  
9 Exhibit 11.

10 A. The Algonquin region and portions of  
11 the eastern region, the District of Tweed and part of  
12 the District of Carleton Place. It covers the Crown  
13 lands within those areas.

14 Q. Now, Exhibit No. 8, Mr. Monzon, is  
15 the Northeastern Ontario Strategic Land Use Plan, and I  
16 understand that this was the final product of the  
17 strategic land use planning exercise which took place  
18 in northeastern Ontario, or to be more specific in  
19 relation to Exhibit 11, the planning region described  
20 as northeastern Ontario?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Could you, before we deal with  
23 certain sections of this document in some detail,  
24 advise the Board or give the Board a general idea of  
25 what this document contains and what it is about?

1           A. The section in the document which is  
2 the introduction on page 1 contains a statement as to  
3 the intent of the Strategic Land Use Plan and it does  
4 that under the title Strategic Land Use Planning and  
5 the statement is at the top of the right-hand column.

6           Generally, a land use plan is a document  
7 which indicates how the land and water base can be best  
8 utilized to meet specific objectives.

9           In this case, the Strategic Land Use Plan  
10 for the northeast contained a statement of the refined  
11 and integrated policies and the policy is defined at  
12 the bottom of the page, and it also includes objectives  
13 and targets, land and water requirements, and together  
14 with some strategies which could be followed for  
15 achieving the objectives.

16          Q. And how, in general terms, did the  
17 exercise, this strategic land use planning exercise  
18 compare to the earlier land use planning done by the  
19 Ministry that you referred to as local planning?

20          A. It was significantly different in  
21 that, as I indicated, this planning exercise required a  
22 clear statement of objective. There was a specific  
23 time frame - in this case, to the year 2000 - it was  
24 part of a hierarchical planning process which proceeded  
25 from the region -- proceeded from the provincial level

1 to the region and then to the district, and then  
2 finally we made sure that the public consultation was  
3 an integral and an on-going part of the exercise.

4 Q. When we reviewed your qualifications  
5 you indicated that you spent some time developing  
6 planning theory and methodology, and was that work in  
7 relation to this particular exercise or the strategic  
8 land use planning exercise?

9 A. It was in relation to the strategic  
10 land use planning exercise and the district land use  
11 planning exercise.

12 Q. In all of the planning regions or  
13 just one of them?

14 A. I was involved from two standpoints:  
15 Specific involvement in the northwestern planning  
16 region, that is hands-on involvement; and then from the  
17 standpoint of methodology and so forth as part of a  
18 provincial group that was working at developing that  
19 methodology.

20 Q. Now, I understand that there were a  
21 number of phases to the strategic land use planning  
22 exercise which culminated in the release of documents  
23 such as Exhibit No. 8?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Could you describe those phases for

1 the Board?

2 A. Well, generally the first phase was  
3 the development of background information and the  
4 publishing of a document in 1978 entitled Background  
5 Information and Approach to Policy in Northeastern  
6 Ontario. The second phase was a review of that  
7 background information, and some determination of  
8 options relative to possible strategic land use  
9 planning. That document for proposed strategic land  
10 use planning for northeastern Ontario was published in  
11 1980. And then the culmination of the third phase was  
12 the publishing of the Strategic Land Use plan for the  
13 northeast and that was done in 1982.

14 Q. Could you perhaps expand just a  
15 little bit on what was involved in each of those  
16 phases, and I would that when you do that if you  
17 include a reference to the type of public consultation  
18 that was involved?

19 A. Background information and approach  
20 to policy was an exercise involving pulling together  
21 the various static or base line data on the resource,  
22 on the various resources: what we knew about  
23 fisheries, what we knew about parks, what we knew about  
24 timber, in terms of the number, variety, where they  
25 were, that sort of thing.



1                   The background information document also  
2                   has some suggestions in terms of policy proposals that  
3                   were incorporated in that larger umbrella, policies  
4                   under which the Strategic Land Use Plan will be  
5                   formulated and there were a number of those.

6                   And I guess an example -- I will have to  
7                   check the document to be specific, but an example would  
8                   probably be a policy that was dealing with agriculture  
9                   and the class of land that -- the classes of land that  
10                  would be suitable - that would be of paramount  
11                  importance for agricultural production.

12                 Q.    When did the public become involved,  
13                 or did it become involved in that first phase?

14                 A.    The public became involved at the  
15                 start of that phase.  There was Regional Directors'  
16                 Citizen Advisory Committee that was appointed when this  
17                 exercise was ongoing.

18                 A number of individuals and groups were  
19                 contacted across the planning region.  I think some 900  
20                 copies of the report were sent out to various  
21                 stakeholders and interest groups representing all of  
22                 the resource interests that we were aware of.

23                 There was a number of group meetings,  
24                 public meetings, open houses, one-on-one discussions  
25                 that were held right across the region.

1                   Q. You refer to the advisory  
2 committee -- just one question before I get into those  
3 committees.

4                   Was it MNR staff that was primarily  
5 obtaining the background information through the  
6 various sources?

7                   A. Yes, it was.

8                   Q. Could you then expand on what this  
9 advisory committee was?

10                  A. The Regional Directors' Advisory  
11 Committee was a committee chaired by the two regional  
12 directors because there were two administrative regions  
13 within the planning region. It was a committee  
14 comprised of a number of citizens representing various  
15 interests across the region; they would have  
16 represented the forest industry, they would have  
17 represented the tourist industry, there would be  
18 representatives of the municipalities, probably trappers  
19 and other such resource interests.

20                  Q. What would they be doing, advising  
21 these regional directors?

22                  A. They advised the regional director on  
23 the appropriateness of the background information, they  
24 gave advice on terms of proposed policy direction, they  
25 formulated the documents and the proposed public

1 consultation processes.

2 Q. So this advisory committee then  
3 was -- were involved before you even entered into the  
4 development of the background information?

5 A. They were involved at the start of  
6 it.

7 Q. All right. And did they have any  
8 continuing role as you went through the three -- the  
9 phases leading up to the release of the document?

10 A. Yes. They assisted in the analysis  
11 and review of the comments that were received as a  
12 result of the background information document and  
13 assisted in the policy revisions that led to the  
14 publishing of the proposed Strategic Land Use Plan in,  
15 I believe, 1980.

16 Q. All right. And were any of the  
17 other -- when did the other groups that you referred to  
18 first become involved in the public consultation?

19 A. They would have - and I can't be  
20 specific in terms of each individual group because I  
21 don't have the list - but they would have been involved  
22 at the start of the process.

23 Q. Again, before the background  
24 information was assembled?

25 A. Yes.

1                   Q. How would their input compare to the  
2 input from the people who would be on the advisory  
3 committee?

4                   A. Their input would have been  
5 considered along -- their input was brought together  
6 and then there was analysis of that input and all that  
7 analysis was taken in front of the advisory committee.

8                   Q. What I am getting at is: How did the  
9 nature of the information that they would provided --  
10 comment that they would provide, how did that compare  
11 to the sort of input that the people who are on the  
12 advisory committee actually had?

13                  A. They would have been providing  
14 specific information as to the appropriateness of  
15 background information and whether or not the policy  
16 would work.

17                  The advisory committee was helping the  
18 Ministry staff to make judgments as to how that  
19 information would be used and how the policy would be  
20 used and whether or not it would be applicable.

21                  Q. Once that background document was  
22 prepared, what happened to it?

23                  A. It was put out for public discussion,  
24 copies of it were mailed out, and I believe some 900  
25 copies of the report were sent out to various



1 stakeholders and groups and submissions were encouraged  
2 relative to the appropriateness of the information and  
3 the policy direction.

4 Q. Was there any public notice in  
5 relation to this planning exercise?

6 A. There would have been public notice  
7 relative to the advisory committees, relative to the  
8 public meetings that were held, and relative to the  
9 open houses that were held. And there was also public  
10 notice relative to the availability of the documents in  
11 the different ministry offices.

12 Q. And the open houses that you refer to  
13 are the sorts of open houses that you described in  
14 response to the question from Mr. Martel?

15 A. Yes, they are.

16 Q. And when within this process of  
17 developing the strategic land use planning exercise  
18 would those open houses have occurred?

19 A. They would have been held after the  
20 publishing of the document and prior to the analysis of  
21 the comments. The purpose of those open houses was to  
22 obtain comments as to the -- relative to the background  
23 information and proposed policy.

24 Q. All right. So when you say, after  
25 publication of the document, you mean after publication

1 of the background document?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. And when was the next open house?

4 A. There would -- I am sorry, there  
5 would have been a series of open houses relative to  
6 this document, relative to --

7 Q. Well, when you say "this document",  
8 you better tell us which one it is.

9 A. Relative to the background  
10 information.

11 Q. Yes?

12 A. And the information from those open  
13 houses and from all of the other comments that had been  
14 received would have taken, there would have been an  
15 analysis taken place, that would have come to the  
16 Regional Directors' Advisory Committee, they would have  
17 given direction to the region, that would have  
18 culminated in the proposed Strategic Plan document.

19 Q. Could you just briefly describe what  
20 that document would contain and what was done with  
21 that?

22 A. That document is very much similar to  
23 the strategic planning document that was initially  
24 published in 1982.

25 Certainly in terms of format, there was

1 an introduction, there was some discussion about  
2 general policies, and there was discussion about  
3 specific resource management policies.

4 In addition, there would have been --  
5 excuse me for a moment. There were objectives set for  
6 the various natural resources that the Ministry had  
7 responsibility for, together with targets and together  
8 with strategies as to how those targets could be  
9 achieved.

10 Q. All right. Objectives, strategies  
11 and targets. They may be used -- or those words may be  
12 used again by other witnesses. Could we just define  
13 them now so that we don't have to define them again?

14 A. Okay. An objective is the indication  
15 of what one is trying to achieve with respect to a  
16 particular resource, and I think the best way to do  
17 this is to use a particular example.

18 Q. Perhaps you could use an example from  
19 the actual strategic land use planning document, that's  
20 a document that everybody has.

21 A. I will try and -- okay.

22 Well, perhaps an easy one would be to use  
23 the objective for lake trout which is shown on page 31  
24 of the Northeastern Strategic Land Use Plan.

25 MR. FREIDIN: Page 31.

1 MR. MONZON: The objective is indicated.  
2 It indicates that we want to manage for survival and --  
3 for the survival and maintenance of significant lake  
4 trout populations, as well as provision of angling  
5 opportunities.

6 So that's generally what the Ministry  
7 would be trying to achieve in the northeastern region  
8 relative to lake trout.

9 In terms of the target, they are saying  
10 that there is some 864 lake trout lakes in the planning  
11 region that have been evaluated and classified and the  
12 target is to concentrate management efforts on some 670  
13 of the those lakes with the highest potential.

14 Then there is a discussion of a rating  
15 system of the various lakes: Type A, which contain  
16 good populations, naturally reproducing; and then there  
17 is a type B and a type C. In each of those types there  
18 is an indication of the types of management effort that  
19 would be required.

20 Finally on --

21 Q. While we are there we might as well  
22 go through...

23 A. To finish with it.

24 On page 32, the next step in the process  
25 would be to take those targets, which is the specific



1 identification of management, in this case, and they  
2 were broken down on the basis of the various districts  
3 within the planning region and that is shown in Table 7  
4 on page 32.

5 Q. So that table indicates where in fact  
6 one would find the various types of trout lakes in  
7 those various districts?

8 A. That's right.

9 Q. The number?

10 A. That's correct. Yes, the number and  
11 type.

12 Q. So in this particular example, the  
13 target, or the thing referred to as a target has a  
14 number associated with it?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. Is that an essential ingredient for  
17 something to be called a target in MNR planning  
18 parlance?

19 A. Yes, it is. Yes, it is. And by the  
20 same token, the standard for an objective is that  
21 something that is capable of being measured.

22 Q. Okay. If we could just go back then  
23 to the proposed strategic land use planning document  
24 that you were referring to. That document was  
25 available for public review of some sort--

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. --or public involvement?

3 A. That was released in March of 1980  
4 and there was then a detailed public review that went  
5 on for that document.

6 Q. And were there open houses in  
7 relation to that document as well?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Any other sort of public involvement  
10 in relation to that document?

11 A. There would be the same sort of  
12 public involvement for that document as I described for  
13 the previous one.

14 Q. All right. And then based on the  
15 input did you receive -- I assume it led to publication  
16 of the document which has been marked as Exhibit 8?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. Are you able to -- all right. the  
19 planning process you described for northeastern  
20 Ontario, how did that compare to the procedure that was  
21 used in northwestern Ontario?

22 A. The same general procedure was  
23 followed in both cases. The only significant  
24 difference would be that a paper on the strategic land  
25 use planning in the northeast was published in May of

1 1980 that accompanied the strategic land use planning  
2 document -- that accompanied the proposed Strategic  
3 Land Use Plan, and it was simply another means to make  
4 people and stakeholders in the area aware of what was  
5 going on.

6 Q. Are you able to provide any  
7 quantification of the public consultation that occurred  
8 in relation to the strategic land use planning  
9 exercises in those two planning regions?

10 A. I don't have the specific numbers.  
11 We can probably provide those.

12 Q. Okay. Mr. Monzon, during the public  
13 consultation phases, were you able to identify matters  
14 of priority to the public?

15 A. Yes, we were.

16 Q. Through what mechanism were you able  
17 to identify those matters?

18 A. Through the various means of public  
19 consultation, the written comments, the open houses,  
20 and discussions - in the case of the northeast and the  
21 northwest - by the Regional Directors' Advisory  
22 Committee.

23 Q. In relation to the northeast, as an  
24 example, can you advise what those particular matters  
25 of priority were?

1                   A. Yes, I can. For ease of the Board,  
2 they are shown on page 4 of the Northeastern Strategic  
3 Land Use Planning document starting at the bottom left.

4                   There are basically six major concerns  
5 that were identified. One being the stability of the  
6 economic base in northeastern Ontario had been given a  
7 high priority. Secondly, real concern with  
8 conservation and the effect of management on the  
9 region's resources.

10                  There was a concern there was a limited  
11 capacity within the region to support existing  
12 utilization of the resource base. There was pretty  
13 strong agreement with the local and traditional users  
14 policy, and I believe we will talk about that a little  
15 bit more here in a few minutes.

16                  There was general agreement with the  
17 planning principles. We have not discussed those, but  
18 those are located on page 7 of the document.

19                  There was concern raised about  
20 environmental issues and the identification and  
21 protection of sensitive areas throughout the planning  
22 region, and there was some significant divergence of  
23 opinion on the tourism and recreation policies.

24                  The issue around that was that people  
25 within the area felt that the local people should have



1 first priority relative to the use of the resources for  
2 recreational purposes and there was not the willingness  
3 that, I suppose, we anticipated to recognize the  
4 concerns that perhaps should be recognized for tourism.

5 So in terms of the -- I think it came  
6 down to -- at least part of that would be a  
7 non-realization of the importance of tourism in some of  
8 those local economies.

9 Q. Mr. Monzon, could you expand a little  
10 bit on the local and traditional users policy?

11 A. That policy is -- for Northeastern  
12 Strategic Land Use Plan is located on page 9 and it  
13 indicated that the Ministry would actively involve  
14 local people and traditional users in the preparation  
15 of the plan and it would emphasize the identification,  
16 consideration of the needs and wants of that group as a  
17 priority.

18 It also indicated that the Ministry would  
19 attempt to avoid disruption of traditional existing  
20 uses as part of the planning process.

21 The thrust of the policy is to recognize  
22 local and traditional users as a primary client group  
23 in all plans and make a special effort to accommodate  
24 their concern.

25 Q. What do you mean, or what's the

1 effect of considering them as a primary client group?

2 A. In terms of the benefits to be  
3 derived from the resources in the area, the feeling was  
4 that the local people - the people who are residents  
5 and working in the area - should have the first  
6 opportunity at those benefits.

7 There was a recognition though that, in  
8 some cases, it may be necessary to give more priority  
9 to issues which were of provincial and national  
10 significance, and the usual example in that sort of  
11 instance is the establishment of a provincial park.

12 Q. I understand that native people or  
13 their concerns were mentioned and are dealt with or  
14 referred to under the local and traditional users.

15 And although there will be some -- the  
16 bulk of the evidence in relation to native people will  
17 be left for another panel, perhaps you could just  
18 describe that particular part of the policy?

19 A. For the purposes of this planning  
20 exercise, native people living in northeastern Ontario  
21 were considered to be among the local and traditional  
22 users of the natural resources.

23 There was certainly a recognition - and  
24 it is stated in the document - of the need to  
25 communicate effectively with those people and the need

1 to give that part of the planning exercise special  
2 attention, given the remoteness of the settlements and  
3 the language differences.

4 MR. MARTEL: Can you tell me how that was  
5 done, the consultation that -- you are talking about  
6 consultations and discussion with the local users and  
7 the native people being one of those users -- I don't  
8 want to take your words out of context.

9 How do you consult with the native people  
10 in those planning exercises?

11 MR. MONZON: Certainly - and if I could  
12 speak from some experience in the northwest - we  
13 endeavour to meet specifically with the various bands  
14 and to meet with them relative to background  
15 information and policy proposals, find out from them  
16 what their issues were, what their concerns were, and  
17 how we can address that.

18 That's a difficult process and one that  
19 is made more difficult by the issue of native rights  
20 and the differences that are apparent between the views  
21 of the native people and the views of the province as  
22 to what those rights are and where they may or may not  
23 be applied. And in some cases it is very clear, and in  
24 other cases it is not so clear.

25 In other cases in the northwest, I know

1       there were attempts to translate documents into Cree,  
2       there were attempts to provide radio tapes relative to  
3       background information and make people aware of what we  
4       were about. Those tapes were translated and sent into  
5       the communities.

6                   MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, could you  
7       also perhaps expand on the issue of protection of  
8       sensitive areas.

9                   It indicates on page 4 that there were  
10      general concerns raised about environmental issues and  
11      the identification and protection of sensitive areas?  
12      Perhaps you could advise what sensitive areas are and  
13      what was done in relation to them?

14                  A. At this point in time, and we define  
15      sensitive areas as areas that - this is all on page 9  
16      again of the document, by the way.

17                  We defined those areas that were areas  
18      that contained features in value, whose preservation  
19      would be the main theme of management. We determined  
20      that we wanted to identify those sites through the  
21      various on-going programs and we would look at the  
22      appropriate management techniques as might be necessary  
23      to undertake protection of those areas depending on  
24      their significance.

25                  In some cases, some of those specific



1 sites would have become part of a provincial park  
2 system because there is a very specific parks objective  
3 that speaks to that, but in other cases they might not.

4 Q. Can you just give me one example of  
5 what you are referring to?

6 A. Can you give me a minute?

7 Q. Sure.

8 A. Michipicoten Post, I believe, at the  
9 mouth of the Michipicoten River is a cultural site that  
10 is, I think -- I believe now in regulation under the  
11 Provincial Parks Act. It was one of the first or  
12 second Hudson Bay Posts that was put in place on Lake  
13 Superior at the time of the fur trade.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Is the definition, Mr.  
15 Monzon, that they would use for "environmentally  
16 significant" the definition of environment under the  
17 Environmental Assessment Act; i.e. including social and  
18 economic concerns, as opposed to just natural  
19 environment concerns?

20 MR. MONZON: At this point in time, and  
21 for this purpose, it was natural environment concerns.

22 MR. FREIDIN: Q. You've mentioned that  
23 there was public consultation in relation to the  
24 Northeastern Strategic Land Use Plan and also the  
25 northwest.

1                   Did that consultation, or did that input  
2                   result in any of the content; did it dictate what the  
3                   content of any of the provisions of those plans were?

4                   A. Yes, it did. There was - I wonder if  
5                   I will find it - but there was significant concern  
6                   relative to the issue of provincial parks.

7                   Q. I think you will find that on page 5.

8                   A. You're right. That issue  
9                   represented, I guess in our view, the most single --  
10                  the single largest concern expressed by the public, and  
11                  as we indicated in the document, as a result of that  
12                  and as a result of the same sort of concern being  
13                  raised in the northwest and in southern Ontario, the  
14                  whole provincial parks proposal underwent a complete  
15                  re-evaluation and the results of that are contained in  
16                  this document, were carried forward into the district  
17                  land use planning process.

18                  I guess I should point out that there  
19                  were a number of other major changes that were made as  
20                  a result of public consultation, they are also listed  
21                  on page 5. They start at the bottom of the left-hand  
22                  column with the revision of the parks proposal and  
23                  continue to the top of the right-hand column on  
24                  downward to the last point which talks about new  
25                  targets for forest management use, sports fish, and

1 Crown land recreation.

2 I think, suffice to say, people had a lot  
3 to say about the appropriateness of the information in  
4 the target.

5 Q. You indicated in your general  
6 description of the document a section dealing with  
7 specific resource policies, and where do we find that  
8 in Exhibit No. 8?

9 A. We find that on page 15.

10 Q. And I understand that commencing at  
11 that page there is a section in relation to a number of  
12 specific natural resources?

13 A. Yes, that's correct.

14 Q. All right. And you had referred us  
15 to the lake trout example.

16 A. Yes, page 31, I believe.

17 Q. And you referred to that section  
18 having an objective, a target and a strategy?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. How were the other resources dealt  
21 with in comparison to lake trout in terms of the  
22 approach?

23 A. The approach was similar for all of  
24 the resources where it could be carried out.

25 Q. Could you advise whether there is, in

1       this particular document, any example of a provincial  
2       policy being addressed at this particular level, at the  
3       regional land use planning level?

4               A. I think the best example would  
5       come -- the quickest one that comes to mind would  
6       probably be moose because the number sticks in my mind  
7       of a herd size of 160,000 animals.

8               Q. And I believe --

9               A. We had a lot of discussions with  
10      local biologists on that.

11              Q. I believe that that appears on page  
12      34 -- or commencing at page 34 under the resource  
13      policy and wildlife management?

14              A. That's correct.

15              Q. And is it apparent from the document  
16      what the provincial policy was?

17              A. No, it would not be apparent from the  
18      document. The target in the document for the northeast  
19      references a herd size of some 69,761 moose - fairly  
20      specific - and a harvest level of some 10,233. That  
21      number of 69,000 represents the portion of that 160,000  
22      number that was assigned to northeastern Ontario.

23              Q. You wouldn't lose your job if you  
24      didn't hit that one dead on?

25              A. I don't think so.



1 THE CHAIRMAN: How would you get a  
2 precise population of any of the wildlife species?

3 MR. MONZON: Populations are determined  
4 through a variety of ways. For moose, for example,  
5 they do a series of - there should be a biologist  
6 around to address this - but they fly a series of  
7 transients and do counts of tracks and/or animals - I  
8 think now it is animals - and then based on the area  
9 surveyed within a relatively contiguous unit you do a  
10 mathematical calculation.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: So it is an extrapolation,  
12 in effect?

13 MR. MONZON: Yes. For deer it is done on  
14 pellet count, the same way.

15 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Are all the resources  
16 done like that in terms of there being a provincial  
17 policy which ends up being shown in a regional target?

18 MR. MONZON: A. Yes, generally that is  
19 the case, it is the case for most of them. There are  
20 some variations, but that is generally it.

21 Q. I note when I went through the  
22 document that there are programs of other ministries  
23 considered in the strategic land use planning document?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. And I am referring to things such as

1 energy at page 13, agriculture at page 25, tourism at  
2 page 28. Why are those particular matters, which are  
3 not within the mandate, if I can use that word, of the  
4 Ministry of Natural Resources contained in this  
5 document?

6 A. They are contained in the document  
7 because they all make demands on the land and/or water  
8 base for which the Ministry is responsible for  
9 achieving its objectives relative, for example, to  
10 moose and deer, timber and what have you.

11 So in attempting to achieve the Ministry  
12 objectives, we had to look at the objectives of the  
13 other ministries and make sure there was a  
14 compatibility and if there were conflicts, to see how  
15 those conflicts could be minimized.

16 Q. All right. I would like to go back  
17 to the topic of targets, and was there a regional  
18 target for timber referred to in this particular  
19 document?

20 A. Yes, there was.

21 Q. And I believe you will find that, Mr.  
22 Monzon, under the heading of Forest Management at page  
23 19.

24 A. 19.

25 Q. And perhaps you could just read the

1 target?

2 A. The target, as it is specified in the  
3 document, is: To provide by the year 2000 -- I will  
4 quote it:

5 "By the year 2000, to annually provide  
6 2.77-million net merchantable cunits of  
7 conifer and 1.65-million net  
8 merchantable cunits of hardwood in Crown  
9 land to meet the wood requirements of the  
10 forest industry which is currently  
11 dependent upon wood fibre from within the  
12 planning region. However, planning must  
13 provide sufficient flexibility and  
14 opportunity for revision to accommodate  
15 the expected increase between 2.77 and  
16 2.86-million cunits of conifer."

17 And then there is a bracket (see Table  
18 2), and Table 2 is shown on page 20, and the target is  
19 shown for the region in terms of conifer and hardwood  
20 and it is split out also by the various administrative  
21 districts.

22 Q. I wasn't going to have you deal with  
23 any portion of that, but perhaps you could just, in a  
24 very general way, define conifer and hardwood?

25 THE CHAIRMAN: You might as well throw

1       cunits in there.

2                   MR. FREIDIN:   Pardon me?

3                   THE CHAIRMAN:   Cunits as well.

4                   MR. MONZON:   Cunits is a measure of a  
5       hundred cubic feet of stacked wood.   Conifer are  
6       generally considered to be evergreens, they are trees  
7       that maintain their needles the year through.   Hardwood  
8       are the deciduous trees, broad leaves and they lose  
9       their needles.

10                  MR. FREIDIN:   Q.   If it all was only so  
11       simple.

12                  MR. MONZON:    A.   Just don't ask me any  
13       more detail, Mr. Chairman.

14                  Q.   Now, Mr. Monzon, where did the  
15       target, which is set out on page 19 for fibre -- for  
16       timber, where did that number come from?

17                  A.   Well, initially that number has  
18       originated from the district.   The target-setting  
19       process which was developed for this planning process  
20       is based upon original information which is compiled  
21       and made available at the district level, information  
22       on present views, on potential, on capability.   In the  
23       case of timber, wood fibre demand, industrial demand.

24                  That information is taken from the  
25       district level, brought together at the regional level,



1       looked at, there may be some modifications either at  
2       the region or the provincial level, relative to factors  
3       which have not been considered at, for example, the  
4       district level, such as the impact of world demand  
5       relative to hardwood pulp, and that information is then  
6       compiled at the district level and then is worked back  
7       down.

8                   Q.   Where does the district get its  
9       information from?

10                  A.   It gets its information from the raw  
11       data which it collects at the field level.

12                  Q.   By the field level, what you are  
13       referring to in this particular context?

14                  A.   I am talking to information which  
15       comes from the work of the unit foresters, what have  
16       you, that goes on at the district level.

17                  Q.   All right. Now, within a district,  
18       am I correct that there are usually -- there are a  
19       number of management units?

20                  A.   Yes, there could be three to four or  
21       parts of three to four management units within a  
22       district.

23                  Q.   And in the region there could be a  
24       number of districts?

25                  A.   Yes, there are from six to eight

1 districts within a region.

2 Q. So if I understand your information  
3 correctly, the target which appears in the strategic  
4 land use planning document is something which has been  
5 worked up from the management unit up to the district,  
6 the districts are all pulled together and taken up to  
7 the regional level?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And then on the second page, going  
10 back to the document that you referred to on page 20,  
11 there is a provincial target, and am I correct that it  
12 is almost, in effect, a reassignment back down to the  
13 districts?

14 A. That's correct. The information is  
15 gathered at the district level, moves to the region, to  
16 the provincial level, and then is worked back down,  
17 based on different adjustments and assumptions and  
18 decisions that are made relative to the land base and  
19 other uses.

20 Q. Are these targets that are put in the  
21 strategic land use planning document, are they fixed?  
22 I mean, are they sort of things that cannot change?

23 A. Oh, no, not at all. They are very  
24 much subject to change.

25 Q. And what are some of the factors

1       which could affect whether or not a particular target  
2       should be changed?

3                       Let me put another question to you first.  
4       Is it mandatory that those targets be met?

5                       A.   At the regional level?

6                       Q.   Yes.

7                       A.   Not to the last moose, no.

8                       Q.   What about the other resources?

9                       A.   No, no.   The numbers are not that  
10       finite.

11                      Q.   And why is that so?

12                      A.   It is so because of the sheer  
13       magnitude of the geographical land base that we are  
14       dealing with and the difficulty in maintaining an  
15       inventory on populations that -- in the case of deer  
16       and moose, for example, are alive and also for fish.

17                      Inventories will change.   There are new  
18       and improved ways of doing inventories, those will  
19       cause adjustments to be made.

20                      Also relative to timber.   For example,  
21       changes in world markets, changes in mill demands,  
22       strikes, fires, all of that will have a significant  
23       effect on the degree to which a particular target can  
24       be achieved.

25                      And so there has to be a great deal of

1 flexibility in the use of those targets and  
2 understanding and the intent for which they are met.

3 Q. Could I just for a moment refer you  
4 to page 98 of the witness statement, and that is a  
5 portion -- or is a page of the District Land Use  
6 Guideline for the Wawa District.

7 And in relation to targets, if I could  
8 refer you to the bottom left-hand side of the page just  
9 above the first bullet point it says:

10 "The actual level or degree of target  
11 achievement depends on a variety of  
12 factors such as..."  
13 and then there is a list.

14 Do those same factors have application or  
15 implications for targets set at the strategic land use  
16 planning level?

17 A. Absolutely.

18 Q. And at the present time, do all of  
19 the matters described under -- or described as factors  
20 which could have an effect in terms of whether you  
21 achieve a target, are those all valid today in your  
22 opinion?

23 A. Oh, yes. There was a significant  
24 example, if I might, three or four years ago where for  
25 a particular industry -- for a particular company, the



1        hardwood pulp market overseas just took off and there  
2        was an opportunity to increase the utilization some  
3        five times; something that could never be predicted in  
4        an exercise such as this.

5                    MR. FREIDIN:  If I could just have one  
6        moment, Mr. Chairman.  I am trying to save time.

7                    MR. MONZON:  I will flip too if that will  
8        help you.

9                    MR. FREIDIN:  Q.  Okay.  Well, let's deal  
10       with this District Land Use Guideline now that we are  
11       there.  This is the District Land Use Guideline for  
12       Wawa District and, before we deal with its contents,  
13       can you advise how this document compares to other  
14       district land use guidelines?

15                   A.  Structurally, and in terms of format,  
16       it is -- they are all very much the same.

17                   Q.  The format is the same, I am sorry I  
18       didn't catch your answer?

19                   A.  Yes.  Structurally and the format,  
20       they are all very much the same.

21                   Q.  What about in terms of their content?

22                   A.  Well, their content in terms of  
23       specifics will vary district to district given the  
24       specifics within the district.

25                   The information generally in terms of,

1. you know, there is forest information there, there is  
2 moose information there. Yes, that is all the same.

3 Q. Now, I understand that after -- there  
4 is a land use planning exercise which related to the  
5 districts in the province, all the districts in the  
6 province?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And when did that process begin,  
9 preparing district land use guidelines?

10 A. The district land use guideline  
11 process would have begun -- it would have begun shortly  
12 after 1980, around 1980, because it would have been  
13 necessary to have an early start in the development and  
14 gathering of the background information.

15 Q. Perhaps you could just explain the  
16 relationship between the strategic land use planning  
17 exercise and the district land use guideline planning  
18 exercise?

19 A. I indicated earlier that it was part  
20 of a revised planning system of the Ministry that we  
21 were looking at a heirarchial planning system moving  
22 from the provincial level down.

23 To do that, it was necessary at the  
24 provincial level to set broad policy. The moose  
25 target -- the moose policy which I gave is an example

1 of that. That policy and the objectives are then  
2 translated in an appropriate way to the region. In  
3 terms of moose, that is translated into a number of  
4 animals.

5 The Regional Land Use Plan then sets out  
6 a series of objectives and targets for all of those  
7 resources. It also deals -- attempts to deal  
8 specifically with major single-purpose land uses, and  
9 the example that would come to mind would be provincial  
10 parks, although there could be other situations such as  
11 new highways, hydro lines, that sort of thing.

12 The intent is to get some of those major  
13 land uses identified and known so that the conflict  
14 resolution which is going to have to take place on the  
15 ground, at the district or field level, can be made in  
16 the context of what is known.

17 Given that there is the regional  
18 objectives and regional targets in place, those are  
19 then, not broken, but assigned on the basis of  
20 capability, and what have you, down to the districts.

21 Before that is done, the districts were  
22 asked to review and test all of the targets together  
23 that were going to be assigned to them to ensure that  
24 there was going to be a fit; that we were not going to  
25 be way out of sync in any one particular area.

1                   Once that was done --

2                   Q.   Out of sync in what respect?

3                   A.   If we had asked -- for example, in  
4                   the northwest, if we had asked Wawa to produce -- I  
5                   don't know what the numbers are, but let's say 10,000  
6                   moose and Wawa came back and said: No, no, we can only  
7                   produce 5,000 moose because the capability isn't there,  
8                   then we wanted to know that in advance of the target  
9                   assignment so that we could look to see if we could  
10                  find an additional area within the region where we  
11                  could look to grow that 5,000 moose.

12                  THE CHAIRMAN: Well, would not a part of  
13                  the provincial target at the regional level have been  
14                  based upon Wawa saying--

15                  MR. MONZON: Yes.

16                  THE CHAIRMAN: --in the beginning that  
17                  they could produce "x" number of moose?

18                  MR. MONZON: Yes, that is correct. And  
19                  then once you do that, then you start to make some  
20                  major land use decisions, for example, the  
21                  establishment of a new park in Wawa, what effect does  
22                  that have on the moose herd.

23                  MR. FREIDIN: Q. Now, very briefly, and  
24                  perhaps it is a question that has already been answered  
25                  and perhaps a question that need not be asked, but I am



1 going to make sure that it is dealt with.

2 What is the purpose of having a District  
3 Land Use Guideline?

4 A. Well, again, any land use plan is  
5 simply an indication of the best use of the lands and  
6 water base to meet specific objectives, and I know I  
7 have said that, I think three or four times now, but I  
8 can't stress it enough.

9 In terms of a specific District Land Use  
10 Guideline, the intent was to provide both staff of the  
11 Ministry, and particularly the stakeholders and client  
12 groups of the Ministry, with an understanding of the  
13 mandate and where particular programs would be likely  
14 to take place on Crown land in a specific district and  
15 perhaps under what sort of conditions.

16 Q. Could you advise, how did the process  
17 for actually preparing the District Land Use Guidelines  
18 compare to the ones that you described for the  
19 preparation of Strategic Land Use Plans?

20 A. The process was similar. The  
21 collection and assimilation of background information,  
22 the seeking of public input and comment, the  
23 preparation of, in this case, planning options for the  
24 particular district, seeking public input and  
25 consultation, and then the preparation of the final

1 District Land Use Guideline.

2 Q. And I note that in Paragraph 33 of  
3 the witness statement, which is on page 17, you  
4 summarize or outline the public participation which  
5 occurred in relation to the District Land Use  
6 Guidelines?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. And is that information -- does that  
9 refer to all of the district land use guideline  
10 exercises; is that what it is intended to do?

11 A. That refers to all of the district  
12 land use guideline exercises that were completed in  
13 1983.

14 Q. And I understand that there were a  
15 couple which weren't completed and we will deal with  
16 that a little bit later in the evidence?

17 A. Right.

18 Q. Did you attend any of these public  
19 information centres that are referred to here?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And as a result of your involvement  
22 in those public information centres, were you able to  
23 obtain a sense of the issues which were of most concern  
24 to the people?

25 A. Yes. It was certainly possible to

1 get a sense from people at those sessions as to what  
2 issues were concerning them.

3 Q. And how did those issues compare to  
4 the ones which you identified as being - I cannot  
5 remember whether it was major issues - but important  
6 issues identified during the strategic land use  
7 planning exercise?

8 A. I think the difference here was that  
9 people were much more concerned about what was going to  
10 take place on specific pieces of land and what was  
11 going to take place on specific lakes within the  
12 district.

13 These are people that were living and  
14 working in the area and they had knowledge of what they  
15 did on a particular water body or about a river that  
16 they particularly canoed on, and they were interested  
17 to see what was being proposed for that particular  
18 chunk of land.

19 Q. And, generally speaking, were you  
20 able to provide that kind of information?

21 A. Yes. That information was provided  
22 through maps, it was provided through text, it was  
23 provided through tables, and it was provided through  
24 staff work, and discussion face-to-face at those  
25 various sessions.

1           Q. Were there any particular sections of  
2 the District Land Use Guidelines which seemed to be, or  
3 in your opinion, were of more interest to members of  
4 the public than others?

5           A. Very much so. What I would call  
6 Section D, the land use areas.

7           Q. And where do we find that?

8           A. We find those starting on page 129 of  
9 the witness statement.

10          Q. Could you advise the Board, Mr.  
11 Monzon, what are land use areas?

12          THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, Mr. Freidin, this  
13 would be a convenient place, before we start this  
14 topic, to take a break.

15          The Board will break for 20 minutes.

16          ---Recess at 3:25 p.m.

17          ---Upon resuming at 4:00 p.m.

18          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Be seated,  
19 please. We are missing most of the front bench here.

20          MS. SEABORN: One member is here.

21          THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to carry it  
22 for now?

23          MS. SEABORN: For the time being, Mr.  
24 Chairman.

25          MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, you



1 indicated during the break that you would like to go  
2 back and deal with just a part of the evidence that you  
3 might have made a mistake in, you are not too sure.

4 MR. MONZON: A. Thank you. I think in  
5 earlier evidence we were talking about the variety of  
6 public consultation we went through and particular  
7 consultation we went through with the native people,  
8 and I think I made reference to translation that we  
9 undertook relative to the Strategic Land Use Plan.

10 I am not sure that we, in fact, did that.  
11 I know we did it later at some of the more detailed  
12 district level planning, and particularly with respect  
13 to the planning in the area of what was known as West  
14 Patricia, and we will get to that, but I don't think in  
15 terms of the translation of documents, that we did that  
16 relative -- we did that in the Strategic Land Use Plan  
17 for either the northwest or the northeast and I don't  
18 think we did the radio tapes for that either.

19 I would just like to set the record  
20 straight.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: But was there consultation  
22 with the native people--

23 MR. MONZON: Yes.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: --in English?

25 MR. MONZON: Yes, there was certainly --

1 I have to answer your question, Mr. Chairman, to say  
2 that there was certainly the attempt made to consult  
3 with the native people.

4 As I indicated earlier, that was  
5 difficult and we have had some problems with that and  
6 we continue to have some problems with that, but  
7 certainly the attempts were made, yes.

8 MR. FREIDIN: Q. You indicated when you  
9 were dealing with these translations -- in a portion of  
10 your evidence you said that you attempted to translate  
11 and then in other areas you just said that you  
12 translated.

13 Was that distinction made consciously?

14 A. It was made consciously in connection  
15 with the West Patricia planning exercise because there  
16 were difficulties that we had there.

17 Q. So, in some cases, you tried to get  
18 translation but you were unable to?

19 A. We were unsuccessful.

20 Q. All right. Now, we were just  
21 starting to deal with the land use areas and you had  
22 referred the Board to page 129 of the witness  
23 statement, and my question was, Mr. Monzon: What are  
24 land use areas and why do you have them?

25 A. Maybe in order to answer this

1 question, if I could refer to another map.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mark that Exhibit 13,  
3 please. Will that just be entitled the Wawa District  
4 map?

5 MR. MONZON: Land use areas.

6 ---EXHIBIT NO. 13: Wawa District land use areas.

7 MR. FREIDIN: Mr. Chairman, the map that  
8 Mr. Monzon has put up is a map which is contained at  
9 the back of the District Land Use Guidelines.

10 The document that you have is a copy of  
11 the map, it doesn't help you very much and, if you  
12 wish, you can refer to the map that's at the back. You  
13 will probably be able to see the areas a lot better.

14 Does anybody else want one? I don't know  
15 whether it is going to be absolutely essential to hand  
16 them out for everybody. We will reduce our storage  
17 costs. I am the only one without one, Mr. Chairman.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to borrow  
19 ours?

20 MR. FREIDIN: No, that's fine.

21 MR. MONZON: Land use areas, Mr.  
22 Chairman.

23 The map which you have in front of you is  
24 the map from the Wawa District Land Use Guidelines and  
25 you will note that there are a number of areas marked

1 on that and they are numbered with a blue number, Nos.  
2 1 through to about 16.

3 MR. FREIDIN: Q. The one difference  
4 being, with the copy that everyone has, is the  
5 boundaries between the areas are not in red as they are  
6 on this particular exhibit?

7 MR. MONZON: A. That is correct. We did  
8 this so that they would hopefully show up.

9 Land use areas are divisions of the  
10 particular district; in this case, Wawa, based on the  
11 premise that there is a similarity of land uses within  
12 a particular area of land and water, and that that  
13 association of land uses is different from the  
14 association of land uses in an adjacent area.

15 MR. MARTEL: Can I just get clarification  
16 because I don't want to get lost here. You said land  
17 use areas are divisions of a district?

18 MR. MONZON: Yes. To quote on page 129  
19 at the top left:

20 "...the division of the district into  
21 smaller areas based on the premise --"

22 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Mr. Monzon, hold on,  
23 Mr. Martel is trying to find it.

24 A. I am sorry.

25 Q. Okay.



1           A. "...based on the premise that the  
2           land use or mix of uses in one area is  
3           significantly different than that in the  
4           adjacent area."

5           MR. MARTEL: Thank you.

6           MR. MONZON: For example, in the Wawa  
7           District, land use area No. 3 and No. 4 are both parks;  
8           one is a Pancake Park, one is Lake Superior.

9           The mix of land uses that is taking place  
10          within this area (indicating) and within this area  
11          (indicating) will be different than what will be going  
12          on in the area that is adjacent.

13          MR. MARTEL: I am trying to put it in  
14          context at the same time, the number of districts we  
15          are considering province wide.

16          MR. FREIDIN: Q. All right.

17          MR. MONZON: A. All right. Each  
18          district would have -- all right, I think I understand  
19          your question.

20          The Wawa District is divided into some 16  
21          land use areas. Each other district would be divided  
22          into a number of land use areas, 1 to 12, 1 to 18, 1 to  
23          34. So each district is subdivided into the smaller  
24          land use areas.

25          MR. FREIDIN: Q. But am I correct, Mr.

1 Monzon, there is no minimum or maximum number of areas  
2 that you would divide any one district into?

3 A. No, that's correct.

4 MR. MARTEL: And the number of districts  
5 we are dealing with, just refresh my memory, please?

6 MR. MONZON: Forty-seven in the province  
7 and in the order of some 25 or so in northern Ontario.

8 MR. MARTEL: Thank you.

9 MR. FREIDIN: Q. I think the districts  
10 are actually listed in Appendix No. 7 to the  
11 Environmental Assessment document.

12 A. Then there is a compendium on page 89  
13 of the witness statement which shows the land use  
14 guidelines.

15 So to continue on, we have the district  
16 subdivided into a number of land use areas --

17 MRS. KOVEN: Excuse me.

18 MR. MONZON: I am sorry.

19 MRS. KOVEN: These areas are not all  
20 particular -- I have a couple of number 4s that are not  
21 really near each other.

22 MR. MONZON: The two number 4s will both  
23 be provincial parks.

24 MRS. KOVEN: I see. All right, I  
25 understand.

1                   MR. FREIDIN: I think when we go into the  
2 description of the areas you will see where the numbers  
3 come from.

4                   MR. MONZON: Yes. So the district is  
5 subdivided into a number of land use areas. In  
6 describing those we chose to do it in three ways: Sort  
7 of an area description, a very general location - a  
8 land use intent which stated the general role, and I  
9 will go through a number of examples to illustrate  
10 this - and then the land use activity that would be  
11 prescribed for the area.

12                   With that land use activity list, the  
13 individual resource activities and developments on  
14 Crown land that would be "permitted within the area"  
15 together with some guidelines as to concerns that would  
16 have to be taken into account.

17                   MR. FREIDIN: Q. Are there any  
18 situations where the activities for a particular area,  
19 a subdivision of the district, might conflict?

20                   MR. MONZON: A. Yes, there are.

21                   Q. Does the District Land Use Guideline  
22 address that possibility?

23                   A. Yes, it does. At the bottom of page  
24 129 of the witness statement, the bottom left, there is  
25 an indication:

1                   "Where applicable, primary and secondary  
2                   land uses will be indicated for each  
3                   area."

4                   The term primary, Mr. Chairman, is used  
5                   to convey the meaning of priority of use rather than  
6                   intensity or abundance; and secondary really means that  
7                   the use is permitted as long as it doesn't interfere or  
8                   it is not in conflict with the primary use.

9                   There will be instances, however, I  
10                  should point out, where some secondary uses, for  
11                  example tourism, as an example, would require specific  
12                  consideration in part of an area and that would require  
13                  some adjustment in the way that the primary use, for  
14                  example timber harvesting, is going to be carried out.

15                  So it does not -- the intent of this is  
16                  not to say that where the primary use is timber, that  
17                  timber proceeds at the expense of everything else.

18                  Q. Could you, by using the map and  
19                  referring to the other sections of the District Land  
20                  Use Guideline, indicate the sort of information or  
21                  guidance which the document contains in relation to  
22                  what can occur in the various subdivisions of the  
23                  district?

24                  A. I think we can do that by using a  
25                  couple of examples and, if I might, the first example



1       that would be of interest would be area No. 2 and that  
2       would be shown on page 136 of the witness statement.

3               To give you an example as to how this  
4       works, this area (indicating) is that portion of the  
5       Chapleau Game Preserve within the Wawa District, and  
6       there is a description of the game preserve and a bit  
7       of the history.

8               In terms of the land use intent, which is  
9       on the right-hand side under b., we are saying that the  
10      area:

11              "...is critical for achieving wildlife,  
12              timber and sport fishing targets.  
13              Integrated management will be  
14              required..."

15              However, any priority of permitted uses  
16      or management activities would favour wildlife  
17      management in order to continue the research and  
18      progress towards developing adequate provincial  
19      guidelines for moose habitat management in areas of  
20      timber harvesting.

21              So we have got specific research-type  
22      activity for moose going on within the preserve, so we  
23      are saying that any activity -- any other activity  
24      that's ongoing will have to take that research activity  
25      into account.

1                   Examples in the guidelines under the land  
2                   use activity, I would refer you to page 137 under  
3                   Forestry. On the top, forestry is shown as a permitted  
4                   use. The guidelines indicate that the activity will  
5                   expand, but there are specific guidelines very relative  
6                   to operating and working plans and road construction.

7                   Hunting, you will notice, is not permitted  
8                   within the preserve, sport fishing is permitted with  
9                   except in Provincial Fish Sanctuaries and wildlife  
10                  viewing is permitted.

11                  You can see the different guidelines that  
12                  are set out for things like mining, road development,  
13                  tourism, hunting camps, trapping, et cetera.

14                  Q. I understand that in the evidence in  
15                  relation to resource management planning or the  
16                  planning of timber management at the management unit  
17                  level, being the same thing, that the manner in which  
18                  this type of document and the type of information that  
19                  you have just indicated is actually used by people who  
20                  prepare timber management plans?

21                  A. Absolutely.

22                  Q. We will deal with that when we get to  
23                  the area on the preparation of those particular  
24                  documents.

25                  Is there another -- well, the guidelines

1       that appear on this particular wildlife preserve, they  
2       relate to specific activities?

3                   A.   That is correct.

4                   Q.   Are the guidelines different from one  
5       District Land Use Guideline to another when, in fact,  
6       you are referring to the same type of activity?

7                   A.   They can be different from one  
8       District Land Use Guideline to another and, in fact,  
9       they can be different from one land use area to another  
10      depending on the specific situation.

11                  Q.   Could you just refer to one other  
12      example of the use of these land use areas?

13                  A.   Another example will be, let's say,  
14      Area 16, which is Dog Lake management area, which is  
15      located in - let's make sure I have it right now - the  
16      northeast corner of the district. This is on page 158  
17      of the witness statement.

18                  This is described -- there is an area  
19      description. The land use intent is a mixed use,  
20      intensive management for appropriate integration of  
21      Crown land recreation, sport fishing, tourism, et  
22      cetera. You will notice that timber management is  
23      not -- timber activity, mining activity is not  
24      mentioned in that land use intent.

25                  If you look at the specific guidelines

1       though related to each of the activities, which follow  
2       immediately below, you will note that forestry, for  
3       example, is a permitted use but there is a specific  
4       guideline relative to operating and annual plans,  
5       obtaining guidelines for the protection of tourism  
6       values and fish and wildlife habitat, and you have  
7       additional guidelines that deal with bait fishing,  
8       cottaging, mining, et cetera.

9                   I think that gives you a flavour as to  
10       how these --

11                   THE CHAIRMAN:  Why, if you are prepared  
12       to condone a specific use, would you not include it in  
13       the intent?

14                   MR. MONZON:  The reason for going to the  
15       intent was simply to indicate the priority or the focus  
16       for the type of activity within the area.

17                   THE CHAIRMAN:  That would be the primary  
18       intent--

19                   MR. MONZON:  Yes.

20                   THE CHAIRMAN:  --for land use?

21                   MR. MONZON:  Yes.

22                   THE CHAIRMAN:  And a secondary use might  
23       be forestry if it took into account the primary use and  
24       the guideline?

25                   MR. MONZON:  Yes.  As I indicated, it is



1        simply an order of priority, not an order of intensity.

2                    THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

3                    MR. FREIDIN: Q. Just to follow-up on  
4        that. In the example or the section that the Chairman  
5        referred to, you indicate that land use intent is to  
6        manage intensively for the items indicated there, and  
7        there is no reference to an actual priority use?

8                    MR. MONZON: A. No.

9                    Q. Whereas in the first example that you  
10        used at page 136 there is specifically reference to a  
11        priority of permitted use or management activities  
12        favouring, in that case, wildlife.

13                    So just following up on your answer to  
14        the Chairman, using the approach or the jargon in the  
15        District Land Use Guideline, when you are looking at  
16        area No. 16, is there a priority use, notwithstanding  
17        it is not specifically identified in a manner similar  
18        to the wildlife preserve which is area No. 2?

19                    A. Yes.

20                    MRS. KOVEN: So what you are saying is  
21        that in this Dog Lake area, the more important  
22        activities are recreational as opposed to forestry?

23                    MR. MONZON: That's correct. In fact, the  
24        Dog Lake area takes on focus for a lot of recreational  
25        activity within the Wawa District. It becomes a centre

1 or a focus point for a lot of activity.

2 MRS. KOVEN: Does that say anything about  
3 the Ministry's ability or desire to assist in the  
4 resources, any of those activities, or there is no kind  
5 of value judgment about that?

6 You are not prepared in this to say we  
7 would be prepared to assist more strongly the  
8 development of recreation in these areas as opposed to  
9 forestry?

10 MR. MONZON: I am not sure I understand  
11 what you mean when you use the term 'assist'.

12 MRS. KOVEN: Whatever you would do to  
13 promote the development of recreational facilities in  
14 this area; for example, developing new Crown land  
15 cottage lots?

16 MR. MONZON: Okay. The focus of our  
17 endeavour in that then would be within this area as  
18 opposed to areas without. This would be one of the  
19 first places we would look.

20 If I could, just because you have  
21 identified it -- not now, but if you look within the  
22 document under the cottaging policy it will identify  
23 the number of cottage lots that the district is  
24 intended to supply, and Dog Lake will be one of the  
25 lakes that is identified as a cottage and potential

1 lake.

2 So that again directs the focus.

3 MRS. KOVEN: If a forestry company was  
4 going through your guidelines and saw that forestry  
5 wasn't mentioned specifically in the land use intent  
6 paragraph, would they just say to themselves: We are  
7 not welcome here, or would they say: Maybe there isn't  
8 room here, or would that not stop a forest interest  
9 from wanting to consider development in that area?

10 MR. MONZON: My sense is the reason this  
11 is written this way is to make it very clear what the  
12 primary use and intent of use is on behalf of the  
13 Ministry, and that is not to say that forestry activity  
14 couldn't take place.

15 But if it is does take place, it is going  
16 to be under pretty severe constraints relevant to  
17 preservation of that other larger recreational  
18 environment.

19 MR. FREIDIN: Q. If forestry - this is a  
20 hypothetical - did take place in the Dog Lake  
21 management area during the actual preparation of a  
22 timber management plan, would the numbers of -- would  
23 the planner have to take into account things in  
24 addition to those things specifically referred to in  
25 the guideline?

1           A. Oh, yes. He would have to -- the  
2 planner would have to -- and the management forestry  
3 together with that interdisciplinary team which we  
4 talked about earlier, would not only have to look at  
5 each of the resources and the guidelines that are  
6 identified here, but they would also have to look at  
7 other aspects and other ways and other strategies that  
8 might be appropriate to make sure that the - if I can  
9 use the term - recreational integrity of the area was  
10 not unduly compromised.

11           Q. Other values, is it possible that  
12 other values that require protection would be  
13 identified during that planning process in addition to  
14 the types of uses which are specifically referred to in  
15 this particular guideline?

16           A. Yes, it could very well be that other  
17 very specific type of values could be identified.

18           Q. That sort of thing will be dealt with  
19 when we deal with timber management planning.

20           THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure I understood  
21 the last question to include what I am going to ask you  
22 now and that is: If there was an activity that was not  
23 listed in the guideline at all, would it be solely  
24 caught by the statement of intent?

25           MR. MONZON: Yes. Yes, it would be



1 solely caught by the statement of intent, and would  
2 have to be looked at very specifically relative to,  
3 again, the recreational integrity of that area and what  
4 would to be done to minimize any potential conflict.

5 The lands -- the activities that are  
6 listed here are the same activities -- these same  
7 activities are listed in land use area, after area,  
8 after area.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: So that is the standard  
10 list?

11 MR. MONZON: The standard list for the  
12 Ministry of Natural Resources.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: There may be other land  
14 uses that somebody could come up with and, therefore,  
15 they would then have to go to the statement of  
16 intent --

17 MR. MONZON: That is correct.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: --so that it could comply  
19 in dealing with that?

20 MR. MONZON: That's correct.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

22 MR. MONZON: We listed them all  
23 alphabetically so there would be no intention to show  
24 priority.

25 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Now, Mr. Monzon, this

1 document is called a guideline?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Is it mandatory that in every case  
4 where an activity that is listed here and occurs in the  
5 area of the Dog Lake management area, must it in every  
6 situation comply -- well, in those situations, what  
7 does the guideline tell the people who want to engage  
8 in that activity?

9 Does it say you can't -- absolutely not  
10 do it, does it say you can do it on certain terms or  
11 conditions, or what does it say? What is the message  
12 that the guideline provides to the planner at the  
13 management unit level in that regard?

14 A. The message is that you can do it  
15 with conditions.

16 Q. And the conditions would be  
17 conditions which will have to show up in the timber  
18 management plan?

19 A. Yes, yes.

20 Q. Would the plan also have to indicate  
21 how, by meeting those conditions, this other value  
22 which you are trying to protect would, in the view of  
23 the author, be protected?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin, are we to  
2 assume that the guidelines have the force of law?

3 MR. FREIDIN: No, you are not.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: I did not think so. So  
5 these are strictly--

6 MR. FREIDIN: Guidelines.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: --guidelines per se?

8 MR. FREIDIN: That's right.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: They are not carried into  
10 regulations or something like that?

11 MR. FREIDIN: No.

12 Q. Now, in your evidence, Mr. Monzon,  
13 you refer to planning options being developed during  
14 this type of land use planning exercise, and page 101  
15 of the witness statement deals with the planning  
16 options for this particular district. Could you define  
17 or tell us what planning options are?

18 A. Planning options, again, are simply  
19 different ways in which the land and water resources  
20 can be used to meet objectives.

21 In the determination of planning options,  
22 as part of the land use guideline process, there would  
23 be one -- normally there would have been one  
24 configuration of land use areas developed for a  
25 district as one option, which will meet the set of

1 targets, and then another option would be a different  
2 configuration of land use areas within the district to  
3 meet the same sets of targets, and it would be -- there  
4 may be a third option. Usually there is a minimum of  
5 two, mostly three, and sometimes four.

6 Then there was the question of analysis  
7 of those options in terms of which one was best from a  
8 social and economic standpoint.

9 Q. Can you describe generally what the  
10 options were in this particular case?

11 A. The description of the options is, as  
12 you indicated, on page 101. There were two options  
13 that were put forward. They were essentially the same.

14 The only difference in this instance was  
15 that Option Two presented put forward a tenth  
16 management area focusing on Crown land Recreation  
17 Access for focusing on recreational activities in three  
18 specified areas.

19 Now, those options were put forward in an  
20 planning option document entitled Proposed Policy and  
21 Planning Options for the Wawa District. A similar sort  
22 of document was produced for all of the other districts  
23 across northern Ontario from which land use guidelines  
24 were prepared for and this document was published in  
25 May of 1982.



1                   Q. The District Land Use guideline, I  
2 understand, contains sections in relation to specific  
3 resources in a fashion similar to the way that you  
4 described the strategic land use planning document?

5                   A. That is correct. There is a series  
6 of "resource policies" which begin on page 111 of the  
7 witness statement and run through to and including page  
8 123 of the witness statement.

9                   Would you like me to go on?

10                  Q. Is the section in relation to  
11 resource policies for the district the same in terms of  
12 the approach of identifying objectives, targets,  
13 strategies and that sort of thing as you described when  
14 giving evidence in relation to the Strategic Land Use  
15 Plan?

16                  A. That is correct. It is a similar  
17 structure and it is done that way so as to focus on  
18 what is to be accomplished in that particular policy  
19 area of when and how.

20                  Q. And just looking -- we have got page  
21 111 in front of us. For cottaging, the objective is  
22 indicated the target is indicated and the strategy by  
23 which one might go about achieving that target and that  
24 objective are described?

25                  A. That's correct. And on page 112

1       there is a table which indicates the various lakes  
2       within the district which would be considered for  
3       cottage lot development.

4               Q.   And there is the Dog Lake item in  
5       that particular table that you referred to?

6               A.   That's correct.

7               Q.   Mr. Monzon, do all -- just to give  
8       the Board an appreciation of where Wawa District is in  
9       relation to the area of the undertaking, can you point  
10      that out on Exhibit No. 11?

11              A.   (Witness indicating)

12              Q.   Thank you.   Do all district land  
13      use -- pardon me, do all districts have District Land  
14      Use Guidelines?

15              A.   No, there are a small number that are  
16      lacking.

17              Q.   Could you identify which ones do not  
18      have a District Land Use Guideline?

19              A.   The districts of Moosonee, Geraldton,  
20      Sioux Lookout and Red Lake.

21              Q.   Perhaps you could just point those  
22      out on the map.

23              A.   Moosonee, which is this area,  
24      (indicating) includes the James Bay and Hudson Bay  
25      Posts, Geraldton, Sioux Lookout, and then Red Lake.

1 (indicating)

2 Q. In the case of -- the red line is the  
3 area of the undertaking?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. In terms of the general area, most of  
6 the actual districts are outside the area of the  
7 undertaking?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Why don't those districts have  
10 District Land Use Guidelines, Mr. Monzon?

11 A. Those districts were part -- well,  
12 there is two reasons: The first reason has to do with  
13 the District of Moosonee, and if I could deal with that  
14 one first.

15 The District of Moosonee, as you are  
16 probably all aware from the map, is quite large. There  
17 is one small settlement -- two small settlements,  
18 essentially Moose Factory, James Bay, and there is a  
19 number of smaller settlements along the James Bay and  
20 Hudson Bay coast.

21 There is - because of the sparseness of  
22 the geographic extent of the district and the fact that  
23 the district is made -- the inhabitants of the  
24 district, particularly along the coast, are native  
25 people, it presents a very unique challenge to the

1 Ministry in arriving at a land use plan for that area.

2 As a result, we are moving very slowly in  
3 the development of a land use guideline for the  
4 Moosonee District. The distances between communities  
5 and the difficulties in communication, just the sheer  
6 distance, makes it very difficult for on-going  
7 communication.

8 At this point in time, I believe the  
9 district has assembled a background information  
10 document and it has translated it and is in the process  
11 of discussing that document with the various native  
12 communities along the coast and within the district.

13 Q. And into what language was the  
14 translation?

15 A. I believe it was translated into  
16 Cree. I stand to be corrected on that, but I believe  
17 so.

18 Q. It was into a native language, in any  
19 event?

20 A. Yes. The other three districts,  
21 Geraldton, Sioux Lookout and Red lake, are part of a  
22 larger issue entitled West Patricia.

23 The Board may recall that in about  
24 mid-1970s there was a concern raised relative to a  
25 proposal to grant a very large additional timber



1       licence to, at that time, the Reid Paper company in  
2       northwestern Ontario.

3               As a result of that issue, the Ministry  
4       undertook the preparation of a large -- undertook the  
5       preparation of a land use planning exercise for what  
6       was entitled the West Patricia area.

7               That included -- essentially, that  
8       included the Districts of Red Lake and Sioux Lookout,  
9       it included a sliver, which is the best definition, of  
10      a portion of the Geraldton District.

11              That planning exercise got underway and  
12      was going to follow the same sort of process as was  
13      followed for the other District Land Use Guidelines.

14              The first order of business was the  
15      compilation of background information of which there  
16      was not very much, given the remoteness of the  
17      Districts of Red Lake, Sioux Lookout and Geraldton.  
18      There was a significant amount of inventory work, basic  
19      inventory work that was done in that area.

20              In and about 1978, the government  
21      established the Royal Commission on Northern  
22      Environment and, as a result of that, the establishment  
23      of that commission undertook a number of hearings  
24      across northern Ontario.

25              The final result or effect on this

1 Ministry's planning process was that the Ministry -- or  
2 the Minister of the day indicated that land use  
3 planning guidelines for those three districts would not  
4 be published until Mr. Falgren, the Commissioner, had  
5 reported and the report had been received and responded  
6 to by government.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Was that also the area  
8 that was involved with the Ministry of the Environment  
9 designating it under the Environmental Assessment Act  
10 when it came to a hearing, for the Reid Paper Company  
11 tract?

12 MR. MONZON: To be honest--

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Just out of curiosity.

14 MR. MONZON: --I don't recall the history  
15 on that part of it. It could be, but I don't know.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: It was one of the first  
17 private designations, I believe, under the Act, this  
18 Reid Paper except it never came to a hearing, and it  
19 never --

20 MR. FREIDIN: There was something out of  
21 that.

22 MR. MONZON: Out of the midst of my  
23 memory, there is a recognition of that. I am not sure  
24 what the environmental assessment was aimed at, whether  
25 it was in the context of land use or whether it was in

1 the context of the mill, I am not sure.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: It probably would have  
3 been the mill, I would have thought, at that time.

4 MR. MARTEL: Is that all north of 50 or  
5 pretty well, the area we are talking about,  
6 Patricia...?

7 MR. MONZON: Oh, yes, yes. It is a  
8 little bit south of 52, as a matter of fact, in terms  
9 of the report that Mr. Falgren brought in and 50  
10 degrees is across here. (indicating)

11 MR. MARTEL: So there are some land use  
12 plans then for something below -- some of it above 50?

13 MR. MONZON: Kenora and Dryden, Ignace,  
14 Nipigon -- Nipigon was excluded, is was not part of the  
15 West Patricia area. The commissionment, on behalf of  
16 the Minister, was not to bring in the land use  
17 guidelines for the West Particia.

18 MR. FREIDIN: Q. And can you advise, has  
19 the government responded or has there been any formal  
20 response to the entire report made by that Commission?

21 A. No, there has been no formal response  
22 to the report. The government is responding to the  
23 report in a number of specific ways; establishment of  
24 regional development councils which advise the various  
25 ministries on issues from time to time, the Ministry of

1 Natural Resources has undertaken an initiative entitled  
2 Crown Land as a Development Tool - attempting to make  
3 Crown land more available for redevelopment purposes  
4 and it is a stimulus for developmental purposes in  
5 northern Ontario - and the Ministry of Northern  
6 Development & Mines, for example, established a  
7 Northern Development Fund which was used to promote  
8 activity in northern Ontario.

9 Q. And does the lack of a District Land  
10 Use Guideline have any effect on the ability to plan  
11 resource management in that area, the area that doesn't  
12 have a District Land Use Guideline?

13 A. I would have to answer that, in this  
14 case, it is not as much of a hardship as one might  
15 think. We have in place a Strategic Land Use Plan for  
16 the northwest which gives broad policy direction  
17 relative to the various resources and land uses and  
18 that is in place and covers that West Patricia area and  
19 those districts.

20 The same time the West Patricia planning  
21 process was, when we started to develop the district  
22 land use planning process across the bulk of the  
23 province, the two processes were brought in line, so  
24 they were moving forward at the same pace.

25 As a result, the background information



1 document was published, it was published for the three  
2 districts; that was followed by public consultation  
3 within those districts; that further resulted in the  
4 development of proposed policy and planning options for  
5 the districts: Open houses, discussions with most of  
6 the people in those districts, within those planning  
7 areas was held.

8 What did not happen was the final step in  
9 the process. But given that the regional policies are  
10 in place, given that the planning options were  
11 developed and put forward and there was discussion,  
12 given the feelings of the local people that were made  
13 quite plain through district staff at those open houses  
14 and in-office discussions, and given the normal  
15 day-to-day contact that goes on between the staff and  
16 the Ministry, there is a fair sense of the priorities  
17 and the issues that need to be addressed.

18 Q. If a timber management plan, for  
19 example, is prepared for an area where part of the area  
20 or -- let's say the management unit, is in this West  
21 Patricia land use area, does the timber management  
22 planning process, which will be referred to in this  
23 environmental assessment, apply to the preparation of  
24 that plan?

25 A. Absolutely.

1                   Q. And are opportunities provided for  
2 public involvement, public consultation in that  
3 particular process?

4                   A. Yes.

5                   Q. Are the opportunities for public  
6 participation any different in that area than in any  
7 other area which falls within the area of the  
8 undertaking?

9                   A. No.

10                  Q. And is there any difference in the  
11 planning process for timber management plans as it  
12 would apply to the area of the undertaking? I am  
13 talking about areas where there were District Land Use  
14 Guidelines and areas where there was no such guideline?

15                  A. No, there would be no difference.

16                  Q. The background information which was  
17 compiled and which was made available for public review  
18 and comment, how did that particular inventory or that  
19 particular collection of background information compare  
20 to background information exercises which took place or  
21 take place elsewhere?

22                  A. It was the same sort of information  
23 and the same type of information was collected. What  
24 was lacking in those three districts was any inventory  
25 work to provide any of that basic information and,

1 consequently, a large amount of inventory was necessary  
2 within those three districts to provide that background  
3 information; inventory which told us things like the  
4 number of cold water lakes in the area, the number of  
5 warm water lakes, the evidence or non-evidence of  
6 caribou, the size of the moose herds, the timber  
7 inventory.

8 All of that had to be done as a  
9 preliminary to publishing the background information.

10 Q. Would that sort of information or  
11 that type of information be more readily available in  
12 the other--

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. --districts where district land use  
15 planning had in fact taken place?

16 A. Yes, it was. Yes, it was.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Freidin it is  
18 approaching a quarter to five. Would you find a  
19 convenient place to conclude for the day?

20 MR. FREIDIN: I think, if you could give  
21 me ten minutes.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

23 MR. FREIDIN: I should be finished, I  
24 think, with this witness.

25 Before I go on to the last area, I refer

1 to Appendix No. 7 as being the area which had the  
2 districts in the area of the undertaking. I am advised  
3 by Mr. Rogers that it is in Appendix No. 9.

4 Unfortunately, I don't think there are  
5 page numbers for those, and you have got to search.

6 MR. MONZON: If I might just make another  
7 point while you are -- I clarified earlier after the  
8 break the issue of the translation and the radio tape,  
9 certainly, with respect to West Patricia and the  
10 attempts to reach the native communities in Sioux  
11 Lookout and Red Lake.

12 In Geraldton, the translation of the  
13 background information document was done and was  
14 forwarded and the radio tapes were also prepared and  
15 sent.

16 MR. FREIDIN: The appendix that I refer  
17 to, Mr. Chairman, is Appendix 9 of the Environmental  
18 Assessment document.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

20 MR. FREIDIN: Q. There is also a section  
21 in the District Land Use Guideline which is called  
22 General Policies, which you will find at page 104.

23 Could you advise: How did those general  
24 policies compare to the general policies that appeared  
25 in the Strategic Land Use Plans and the evidence that



1       you gave in relation to them?

2                   A. Those are essentially the same  
3 policies, the same type of policies that appear in the  
4 Regional Land Use Plans. They are intended to be - to  
5 coin a phrase - umbrella policies under which other  
6 specific resource policies and land uses would take  
7 place.

8                   Q. I have just a few questions -- a  
9 series of questions in relation to targets. Would you  
10 please turn to page 118 in the witness statement, Mr.  
11 Monzon.

12                   Do you have that area -- that page which  
13 deals with the resource of forest management?

14                   A. Yes, sir.

15                   Q. And there is a target indicated at  
16 the bottom of the page?

17                   A. That's correct.

18                   Q. Do you see that? Where did that  
19 timber target come from?

20                   A. That timber target is the result of a  
21 process in which districts were asked to determine the  
22 potential capability demand for wood fibre within their  
23 various districts.

24                   I think I indicated earlier those  
25 targets -- those numbers were accumulated at the

1 regional level, then to the provincial level, were  
2 looked at, some different assumptions were -- or some  
3 additional assumptions, decisions were made, there were  
4 adjustments made at the provincial level relative to  
5 major single land uses, provincial parks, which have  
6 been identified as part of the process, hydro lines,  
7 roads, what have you.

8 As a result, those targets were adjusted  
9 at the provincial level, adjusted to the regional level  
10 and then fed back down to the district level.

11 Q. The timber management plan, when you  
12 do that sort of planning; am I correct that it is  
13 called resource management planning?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. Does the resource management planner  
16 then writing a timber management plan have to meet --  
17 does he have to meet the target in the District Land  
18 Use Guideline or any predetermined part thereof?

19 A. No, he is not -- he or she is not  
20 held to the precise number within that guideline.

21 Q. Do timber management plans contain  
22 anything similar to a production target that appears in  
23 the District Land Use Guideline?

24 A. Yes, they contain production  
25 objectives.

1 Q. And what is a production objective in  
2 a timber management plan?

3 A. It is the amount of wood that is  
4 likely to be harvested over the five-year term of the  
5 plan.

6 Q. And that is something which is  
7 calculated each time a timber management plan is  
8 prepared?

9 A. That is correct. And while there is  
10 some stability in terms of factors that are taken into  
11 that calculation, such as capability, the soil and the  
12 area to produce timber, there are other factors which  
13 differ relative to mill demand, relative to fire,  
14 relative to funding.

15 Q. If you take all the management units  
16 in a district and you add up the production objectives  
17 in each of them, will they add up to the District Land  
18 Use Guideline target?

19 A. No, they will not.

20 Q. Do they have to add up?

21 A. No, they do not.

22 Q. Can you explain why not?

23 A. Essentially for two reasons. The  
24 forest management units are not necessarily -- the  
25 boundaries of the forest management units are not

1 necessarily synchronized with the administrative  
2 boundaries of the district, so there will be overlaps  
3 and, if I can use the term, underlaps. So it would be  
4 impossible for them to add up.

5 At the same time, the targets or the  
6 objectives in the timber management plan are over a  
7 five-year period and the time frame in this document is  
8 20 years and then defined more precisely, a single.

9 Q. A single amount as of the year 2000?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. In the District Land Use Guideline?

12 A. That's right.

13 Q. What then is the purpose of the  
14 production target in the District Land Use Guideline in  
15 relation to - and I am talking now about, you know, the  
16 timber production target?

17 A. They really provide a benchmark in  
18 terms of how well the district is doing in meeting its  
19 objectives and it provides a measure by which the  
20 district and the staff within the district can be held  
21 accountable for carrying on their work.

22 One of the problems, if I might,  
23 referring to the drawing that we had in this sort of  
24 situation--

25 MR. FREIDIN: The witness is referring to



1 Exhibit 12.

2 MR. MONZON: To Exhibit 12 -- was that  
3 there were no targets, there were no identification of  
4 the amount of wood that was required. And the purpose  
5 of this exercise is to provide those benchmarks to see  
6 how we are doing,

7 MR. FREIDIN: Q. And what would happen,  
8 Mr. Monzon, if an assessment indicated that the  
9 District Land Use Guideline target was not or might not  
10 be met?

11 A. It would depend to the degree that  
12 the assessment showed a variance. If there was a small  
13 variance, it would not probably be thought to be of  
14 consequence; but if it was a significant variance -- I  
15 am afraid you are going to ask me what the term  
16 significant means -- but, if there was a significant  
17 variance, then the district would want to, along with  
18 the region, re-examine the factors under which the  
19 target had been identified and would want to re-examine  
20 the assumptions that were put forward when that target  
21 was established, and it may be there would be some  
22 searching going on in terms of what had happened to  
23 cause that differential.

24 Now, it may be that the variance is quite  
25 explainable, due to a fire or whatever; it may be

1 that -- it could be that there was a miscalculation.  
2 Those are the sorts of things that would have to be  
3 checked and then adjustments made.

4 MRS. KOVEN: Are the sorts of  
5 calculations that take place usually an overestimate or  
6 an underestimate?

7 MR. MONZON: Usually it is an  
8 underestimate. In other words, the estimates of the  
9 amount of timber that are available to be harvested is  
10 usually underestimated to a considerable -- to some  
11 degree.

12 MR. FREIDIN: Q. Are people at the  
13 management unit level - and I guess I should refer  
14 specifically to the unit forester or the company  
15 forester - who is preparing a timber management plan,  
16 are they required to meet any particular -- let me just  
17 rephrase that.

18 I am speaking about the unit forester.  
19 Are the people at the management unit level that  
20 prepare timber management plans required to meet any  
21 particular timber production objective regardless of  
22 possible detrimental environmental effects of obtaining  
23 that production objective?

24 A. Certainly not.

25 Q. Why do you say certainly not?

1           A. To do so would be to go contrary to  
2 the whole planning theory that we have spent today  
3 describing that is solidly in place within the  
4 Ministry.

5           It would also be totally against the  
6 philosophy of integrated resource management and in  
7 maximizing the benefits and minimizing the conflict.  
8 The planning process that is being proposed for -- is  
9 in place for timber management planning would not let  
10 it happen.

11          Q. And I understand that this particular  
12 topic and, in fact, that particular question will be  
13 addressed by the panel that will be describing the  
14 timber management planning process in some detail?

15          A. That is correct.

16          MR. FREIDIN: Those are my questions of  
17 this witness, Mr. Chairman.

18          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Freidin.

19          In view of the fact that you have  
20 examined this witness, although in a panel, you seem to  
21 have examined Mr. Monzon sort of by himself entirely  
22 without referring back and forth to other member, Mr.  
23 Douglas, on the panel.

24          I am just wondering, when it comes to  
25 other counsel asking questions of this witness, whether

1       it would be preferable to wait until the panel is  
2       finished?

3                   MR. FREIDIN: I would prefer that we do  
4       that, for a number of reasons.

5                   THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

6                   MR. FREIDIN: In this panel, and quite a  
7       few of the other panels.

8                   The main reason for putting more than one  
9       person there was not to sort of jump back and forth  
10      through the evidence, all the evidence, but it was to  
11      put together certain topics which seemed to fit  
12      together where the witnesses could actually --

13                  THE CHAIRMAN: After Mr. Douglas has  
14      completed his testimony, then, we will get into the  
15      question by other parties and cross-examination?

16                  MR. FREIDIN: That's correct.

17                  THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

18                  MR. FREIDIN: That is what I would  
19      prefer.

20                  THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cosman?

21                  MR. COSMAN: Mr. Chairman, is Mr.  
22      Freidin's estimate of completing tomorrow still in  
23      place?

24                  MR. FREIDIN: We are starting at 8:30  
25      tomorrow?



1 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I believe we would  
2 like to start at 8:30 and, as I mentioned this morning,  
3 we will probably rise no later than three and perhaps  
4 even a little earlier.

5 MR. FREIDIN: My guess is we will make  
6 it. We will finish with these two witnesses tomorrow.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: In chief?

8 MR. FREIDIN: In chief.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

10 Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

11 MS. SEABORN: Mr. Chairman, just before  
12 we adjourn, I just want to advise you that we now have  
13 copies of the Review. I have left six at the front.

14 It was to be marked initially as Exhibit  
15 5, but I also have copies for anyone in the room who  
16 doesn't have the Review.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Thank you.

18 We can mark that Review now, Exhibit 5.

19 ---EXHIBIT NO. 5: Review Under the Environmental  
20 Assessment Act, prepared by  
21 ministries and agencies of the  
Province of Ontario.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies and  
23 gentlemen. We will adjourn now until 8:30 tomorrow  
24 morning.

25

1 ---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 5:00 p.m., to  
2 reconvene Friday, May 13th, 1988, commencing at 8:30  
3 a.m.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25









